Of Discourse and Dialogue:
The Representation of Power Relationships
in Selected Plays by Shakespeare

By

Seugnet du Toit

Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree Master of Arts at the
University of Stellenbosch

Supervisor: Dr Edwin Hees

April 2004

Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted at any university for a degree.

Abstract

In this thesis I will look at the way in which power relationships are presented in Shakespeare's dramas, with specific reference to the so-called "Henriad", *Measure for Measure* and *The Tempest*. Each play consists of a network of power relationships in which different forms of power interact on different levels. Different characters in the above-mentioned plays have access to different forms of power according to their position within these networks. The way in which the characters interact could also cause or be influenced by shifts and changes in the networks of power relationships that occur in the course of the action.

I will use Michel Foucault's theories on the relationship between power, knowledge and discourse as a guide to my analysis of *Measure for Measure*. I will also use selected aspects of Mikhail Bakhtin's theories on language and literature, with specific references to the concepts of "dialogism" and "heteroglossia" or "many-voicedness", as well as his concept of carnival, which implies a temporary inversion in power relationships in an unofficial festive context, as a guide to my analysis of the Henriad. I will use a combination of the theories of Foucault and Bakhtin in my analysis of *The Tempest*.

I have chosen the terms "discourse" and "dialogue" as key terms in the title of this thesis not only because they play an important role in the theories of Foucault and Bakhtin respectively, but also because they play an important role in the analysis and representation of power relationships. According to Robert Young, Foucault relates "the organisation of discourse...to the exercise of power" (10). One could also say that the power relationships in a society are reflected in the portrayal of a dialogue between different voices representing different sections of or classes in that society as in Bakhtin's principles of dialogism. I will explain the overall importance of these terms in more detail in the Introduction and the other relevant chapters.

In the introductory chapter I will first provide a theoretical background for the thesis as a whole. Then I will look at the specific theoretical principles that are relevant to each chapter. In the chapter on the Henriad I will look at the way in which an alternative perspective on power relations and the role of the king are created by looking at them from the perspective of Bakhtin's concept of carnival. In the next

chapter, I will show how *Measure for Measure* presents us with an evaluation of different strategies of power, which I will look at from the perspective of Foucault's theories on power, knowledge and discourse. In my chapter on *The Tempest* I will combine aspects of both theories in my analysis of a play that presents us with a complex analysis of power relationships as a social phenomenon. In the concluding chapter I will look at the different perspectives on power relationships that emerged from my previous chapters and attempt to see what its implications are for the representation of power relationships in Shakespeare's work and perhaps as a social phenomenon.

Opsomming

In hierdie tesis gaan ek kyk na die wyse waarop magsverhoudinge uit gebeeld word in Shakespeare se dramas, met spesifieke verwysing na die sogenaamde "Henriad", *Measure for Measure* en *The Tempest*. Elke drama bestaan uit 'n netwerk van magsverhoudinge waarin verskillende vorme van mag op verskillende vlakke wisselwerking uitoefen. Verskillende karakters in bogenoemde dramas het toegang tot verskillende vorme van mag volgens hul posisie in die netwerke. Die manier waarop die wisselwerking tussen die verskillende karakters plaasvind kan ook verskuiwings en veranderinge in die netwerk van magsverhoudinge in die loop van die aksie veroorsaak, of daar deur beïnvloed word.

Ek gaan Michel Foucault se teorieë oor die verhouding tussen mag, kennis en diskoers as 'n gids tot my analise van *Measure for Measure* gebruik. Ek gaan ook uitgesoekte aspekte van Mikhail Bakhtin se teorieë oor taal en literatuur, met spesifieke verwysing na die konsepte van "dialogisme" en "heteroglossia" of "meerstemmigheid", sowel as sy konsep van karnaval, wat 'n tydelike ommekeer in magsverhoudinge in 'n onoffisiële feestelike konteks impliseer, as 'n gids tot my analise van die Henriad gebruik. Ek sal 'n kombinasie van die teorieë van Foucault en Bakhtin gebruik in my analise van *The Tempest*.

Ek het die terme "discourse" en "dialogue" as sleutel terme in die titel van hierdie tesis gebruik, nie net omdat hulle 'n belangrike rol in die teorieë van Foucault en Bakhtin onderskeidelik speel nie, maar ook omdat hulle 'n belangrike rol in die analise en uitbeelding van magsverhoudinge speel. Volgens Robert Young verbind Foucault die manier waarop diskoers georganiseer word met die uitoefening van mag (10). Mens kan ook sê dat die magsverhoudinge in 'n gemeenskap gereflekteer word in die uitbeelding van 'n dialoog tussen verskillende stemme wat verskillende dele van of klasse in die gemeenskap verteenwoordig soos in Bakhtin se beginsel van dialogisme. Ek sal die algehele belang van hierdie terme in meer besonderhede bespreek in die inleiding en die ander relevante hoofstukke verduidelik.

In die inleidende hoofstuk gaan ek eers 'n teoretiese agtergrond vir die tesis as geheel verskaf. Dan sal ek kyk na die spesifieke teoretiese beginsels wat relevant is tot elke hoofstuk. In die hoofstuk oor die Henriad gaan ek kyk hoe 'n alternatiewe

perspektief op magsverhoudinge en die rol van die koning geskep word deur hulle te beskou van uit die perspektief van Bakhtin se konsep van karnaval. In die volgende hoofstuk sal ek kyk hoe *Measure for Measure* 'n evaluasie van verskillende magsstrategieë aan ons voorlê, waarna ek gaan kyk van uit die perspektief van Foucault se teorieë oor mag, kennis en diskoers. In my hoofstuk oor *The Tempest* gaan ek aspekte van albei die teorieë kombineer in 'n drama wat 'n komplekse analise van magsverhoudinge as 'n sosiale verskynsel aan ons voorln sosiale verskynsel aan ons voorlê. In die laaste hoofstuk gaan ek kyk na die verskillende perspektiewe op magsverhoudinge wat voortspruit uit die voorafgaande hoofstukke en kyk wat die implikasie daarvan vir die uitbeelding van magsverhoudinge in Shakespeare se werk en as 'n sosiale verskynsel is.

7

Contents:

8

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank dr. Edwin Hees for all his help and patience while I was writing this thesis. Without his practical advice and his eye for detail I would never get this far. I would also like to thank my mother for helping me to stay on track and for taking care of the practicalities of life. I finally wish to express my sincere gratitude to everyone who believed in me and encouraged me when I felt helpless or stuck in a rut.

Thank you very much.

Chapter 1

Introduction and Theoretical Background

According to Catherine Belsey "Power...is always a relation, power over another" (*Subject of Tragedy* 98). Every Shakesperian drama consists of a network of power relationships in which different forms of power interact at different levels in society. Each character or group of characters has access to different forms of power according to their position within this social network. Therefore, one can also say "social relationships are, intrinsically, relationships of power" (Montrose, "Eliza, Queen of Shepheardes" 153).

In his book *Faultlines*, the cultural materialist critic, Alan Sinfield, quotes the following observation by Anthony Gibbens: "Power relations are always two way, that is to say, however subordinate an actor may be in a social relationship, the very fact of involvement in that relationship gives him a certain amount of power over the other" (47). This brings us to the conclusion that power relations do not only function from top to bottom, but also from bottom to top in the network of power relationships that exists within that society.

In this thesis I will look at the way in which power relationships are presented in Shakespeare's dramas. In the networks of power relationships with which we are presented in each drama, power could exist on a personal, social, and on a national or international political level. In a play like *The Tempest* it could even be shown to exist on a cosmic level. At these levels, power could manifest itself spiritually, intellectually, physically or mechanically, or become institutionalised to create an ordered society. Later in this thesis the relevant references to other possible manifestations or levels of power will be made if it seems necessary. The interaction between the different forms of power on different levels in the society with which we are presented, also implies a relationship between themselves, and with the society in which they manifest themselves. I will also show how different forms of power will be available to different members of society according to their position within the given network of power relationships and the strategies of power that they might employ. This will both be determined by and reflected in the official or authoritative discourses of that society and in the dialogue or interaction between the different

voices in society that stand in relation to each other. That is also why the theories of Michel Foucault and Mikhail Bakhtin with specific reference to the terms "discourse" and "dialogue" will play such an important role in my analysis of the representation of power relationships in Shakespeare's dramas.

I will use Foucault's theories on the relationship between power, knowledge and discourse, and selected aspects of Bakhtin's theories on language and literature, with specific reference to the principles of "dialogism" and "heteroglossia", as well as his concept of carnival, as a guide to my analysis of power relationships in Shakespeare's dramas. In my application of these theories to the analysis of power relationships in specific plays by Shakespeare, it will create useful perspectives on the way in which power manifest itself in these plays, as well as the way in which power relationships function.

In this introductory chapter I will first look at the importance of the concepts of discourse and dialogue in the theories of Foucault and Bakhtin. Then I will look at the specific theoretical principles that are relevant to each chapter. In the chapter on the Henriad, I will look at the way in which contrasting perspectives on power relationships and the role of the king are created by looking at them from the perspective of Bakhtin's concept of carnival as opposed to the official views and formality of the institutions of state and church. In the next chapter, I will show how *Measure for Measure* presents us with an evaluation of different strategies of power, which I will look at from the perspective of Foucault's theories on the relationship between power, knowledge and discourse and its effect on the individual as a subject.

In my chapter on *The Tempest*, I will combine aspects of the work of both these theorists in my analysis of a play that presents us with a very complex set of power relationships. The meeting between members of the society in Europe combines with the society on the island, each of which has their own networks of power relationships, into a new society with a new set of power relationships until the networks of power relationships in Europe and on the island are restored to what appears to be their proper structures. In the concluding chapter I will look at the different perspectives on power relationships that emerged from the previous chapters and attempt to see what their implications are for the representation and analysis of

power relationships in Shakespeare's work, and perhaps as a comprehensive social phenomenon.

I have chosen the terms "discourse" and "dialogue" as key terms in the title of this thesis not only because they play an important role in the theories of Foucault and Bakhtin respectively, but also because they will be shown to play an important role in the representation and analysis of power relationships in Shakespeare's dramas. Because the two terms play such an important role in the theory itself and its application to the analysis and representation of power relationships, it can have a unifying bearing on the thesis as a whole.

The terms "discourse" and "dialogue" are also linked to other important concepts in both Foucault's and Bakhtin's work. Foucault links the concept of discourse to power, knowledge and truth, as well as the formation of the individual human subject in society. Bakhtin opposes the concept of the dialogue in language and literature, which implies the interaction between different voices that represent different sections of or classes in a "heteroglot" or many-voiced society in single texts or series of texts, to the monologic text in which only the authorial voice or official discourse is allowed to express itself, or only a single subjective voice is speaking. Yet a dialogic text such as a Shakespearean play often reflects the power relationships in the society that it portrays.

One of the most important aspects of Foucault's theories concerns the relationship between power, knowledge and discourse. According to Robert Young, Foucault's philosophical theories moved "towards the analysis of the relation between knowledge and power, at the level of social practices, within the functioning of specific discursive/ institutional apparatuses" (10). Young also points out how Foucault relates "the organisation of discourse...to the exercise of power" in 'The Order of Discourse', where "Foucault specifies the practices of control and restraint that mark discourse at every point" (Young 10). The logical conclusion would be that knowledge is a very important source of institutional power through the medium of discourse, which serves as both a symbol and an instrument of power.

Discourse reflects as well as controls the power relationships in society as a form of display and a control mechanism for knowledge, with which it stands in an

interactive relationship. The level at which power would manifest itself from the knowledge contained in discourse depends on the type of discourse. The people or institutions that regulate discourse have access to the knowledge that is contained in it, and can use it as a source of institutionalised power. The nature and use of other sources, symbols and instruments of power will be discussed later in this thesis.

Some forms of discourse can be perceived as subversive and seem to undermine the established power structures in society by exposing forms of knowledge that are normally forbidden or restricted if they are allowed expression. If forbidden forms of knowledge and discourse are allowed expression, power can be distributed to those whose voices are not always heard. In his dramas, Shakespeare sometimes let the voice of madness be heard, a voice which would be repressed or disregarded under "normal" circumstances. The discourse of the mad man is opposed to that of reason, which is normally ascribed to the figures that represent authority in society or the state, or certain predetermined institutions. In plays like *Hamlet*, *King Lear* and *Macbeth* the voice of madness expresses a deeper disturbance in power relationships that must be resolved at a later stage. In my chapter on *Measure for Measure* I will show how the voice of Isabella as a subordinate woman that is first rejected as the voice of madness by a powerful figure, becomes the voice of truth in the hands of the Duke, who is an even more powerful and knowledgeable figure who also ultimately controls the official language of the state and its laws (*Measure for Measure* 5.1.21-380).

Although the reigning power structures of the established order might find the discourse or voices of madness and other representatives of seeming disorder and dissent to be disruptive, they play an important role in balancing or stabilising power relationships in many of Shakespeare's plays. The disregarded voice of the madman can give expression to the weaknesses and imbalances in the power structures of society that might otherwise have remained invisible. The tendency of society is to disregard the mad person and take all his or her powers away, yet in Shakespeare's drama his voice has a great emotional power and is given the opportunity or power to express that which would otherwise be inexpressible. The voice of madness could also be used to indicate deeper disturbances in power relationships that might otherwise have gone unnoticed.

In the final act of *Measure for Measure*, for example, one can see how official knowledge and discourse can be manipulated. One can also see how the many prohibitions surrounding the discourse of sexuality and politics can be manipulated by the Duke's first deputy, Angelo, a powerful figure who can turn testimony against him by Isabella, a woman held powerless in her society, into the voice of madness as opposed to his version of truth and reason. When others back up her testimony, Angelo treats it as the voice of dissidence and treason as opposed to law-abiding and loyalty. Even then the woman is portrayed to be weak and easily prone to manipulation by an outside force. Only when her testimony is backed up by the knowledge and testimony of the Duke, an even more powerful figure, the official truth comes nearer to the reality of the situation. Angelo would have her portrayed as a threat to his authority, as well as that of the Duke, but it is his own weakness that threatens his authority. Although the voice of madness can indicate disturbances in power relations, the attempt to disregard the voice of truth as the voice of madness causes even greater disturbances in power relationships instead of fixing smaller ones. That is why the Duke's search for truth and knowledge to re-enforce his knowledge and control of the official discourse is so important in his attempt to restore power relations in his society.

New Historicists and Cultural Materialists like Stephen Greenblatt and Allan Sinfield are also influenced to a certain extent by the theories of Foucault and Bakhtin among others. They often trace patterns of the legitimation of authority, the creation of the appearance of subversion and its containment by figures of authority in power relationships. As a strategy of power, these patterns could be utilised in either a negative or a positive way. In all three plays discussed in this thesis one can see how the rulers attempt to re-legitimise their authority by containing potential subversive elements in their societies. Angelo seems to be using this strategy, at least in this last scene in which he is first confronted by Isabella, and then by the Duke. It seems as if the Duke himself uses this strategy throughout this play as a whole, although the events in the play could also be indicative of a greater weakness or a process of change in the society depicted in the play. This strategic pattern of legitimation, subversion and containment could also be traced in the Henriad with its political rebellions and war on the one hand, and its many carnivalesque-type situations on the other. In *The Tempest* we also encounter these patterns in Prospero's relationships to

other characters like Caliban, his "servant-monster", and his brother, Antonio among others.

As a whole, *Measure for Measure* lends itself very well to a Foucauldian analysis, especially in terms of the relationship between power, knowledge and discourse and its effect on the formation of the individual subject through the early manifestations of mechanisms of power like surveillance and confession that have been instituted by the modern state. In his essay entitled "The Subject and Power", Foucault refers to two meanings that can be applied to the word subject. It could mean "subject to someone else by control and dependence", or "tied to his identity by a conscience or self-knowledge" (212). It is also interesting to note that the Renaissance is also known as the "early modern" period, which anticipates the modern state as it is described by Foucault. If the play is read in the context of this period as Foucault sees it, one could also see how discipline of the individual subject is shifting from the physical punishment of the body (torture and "the spectacle of the scaffold") to the observation, formation and control of the mind (surveillance and confession).

In the first scene of the play, Shakespeare uses certain terminology as a part of the official discourse of power in the society of the play that corresponds to those that are used by Foucault in certain stages of his work. Foucault addresses many of the issues that are raised in *Measure for Measure* in *The History of Sexuality* and *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, which were written during Foucault's "genealogical" stage using a method known as the "interpretive analysis of social practices". The issues that are addressed include questions of power in relation to the individual subject and the relationship between power and knowledge as it is determined or reflected in discourse. An example of this can be found in my discussion of the Duke's opening speech in *Measure for Measure* in the chapter about that play. Other issues that are addressed include questions of sexuality and marriage and the way in which the mechanisms of confession and surveillance work to form the individual both as a subject in awareness, and as an object of study to be controlled or manipulated. It is interesting to note how the workings and mechanisms of certain institutions in the society of the play prefigure those of other institutions that would later evolve in disciplinary societies as described by Foucault. In the chapter on

Measure for Measure I will specifically look at the implication of these theories for my reading of *Measure for Measure*.

My Foucauldian analysis of *Measure for Measure* is based on the methods that he used during his genealogical stage. This approach not only differs from the traditional literary critical approach, but also from that of the cultural materialist, Jonathan Dollimore, who approaches *Measure for Measure* from a slightly different perspective. He looks at similar issues in his analysis, but in a broader cultural context. In addition to that he supplements his analysis with certain Bakhtinian theories, which could help us to see the structures of society from a wider angle. The interaction between the classes and the individuals can be seen from that point of view as a continuous dialogue, an animated form of discourse that also caters for fluctuations in society.

The concept of carnival, which implies a temporary reversal of power relationships and contained resistance to power structures and plays a very important role in Bakhtin's theories, could not be applied precisely to an analysis of *Measure for Measure*, but it becomes a strong factor in other plays or groups of plays by Shakespeare that deals with power relationships, like the Henriad and The *Tempest*, which I will also examine in the course of this thesis. I will examine the former from the point of view of Bakhtin's theories on carnival, and the latter on the basis of selected aspects of the theories of both Foucault and Bakhtin.

Although the concept of carnival plays a very important role in the theories of Bakhtin, the central concept in all his theories is that of the dialogic. Whereas Foucault sees the concept of discourse in the context of its relationship to knowledge and power and the formation of the individual subject, Bakhtin sees it in the context of a series of speech utterances that forms part of a continuous dialogue, whether it is in everyday language or in literature. On the one hand, these utterances would then be a response to previous utterances and, on the other hand, it would stand in anticipation of future responses, as in an actual dialogue between people. Because Bakhtin sees language as a part of a continuous dialogue, the concept of "dialogism" or the "dialogic" plays an important part in Bakhtin's theories on both language and literature. The sense of dialogue between different voices in the societies that are

portrayed in Shakespeare's plays also become an expression of the power relationships that exist within those societies.

Another concept in Bakhtin's theories that springs from the basic notion of dialogism is that of heteroglossia or "many-voicedness" as opposed to monologism or "single-voicedness". Bakhtin often traces heteroglossia or the interaction between different voices in society as it appears in the novel, where it can usually be traced in a social context where centrifugal (or decentralising) and centripetal (or centralising) forces are in a constant battle for control. In addition to this I will posit that the different voices that stand in a dialogic relation to each other in a heteroglot society, also stand in a relationship of power to each other. The opposing concept of monologism refers to a situation where the official or dominating voice in society is the only one that is allowed to make itself heard. This dominant voice would then be the official voice of authority or of the power structures in that society.

Bakhtin posits the novel as the predominant literary genre in which heteroglossia can manifest itself best. Certain other earlier genres, which were often satiric in nature, would also represent the other voices in society. They could be seen as the forerunners of the novel as a genre. He writes extensively about the emergence of the novelistic genre, and its novelising or dialogising effect on older, more established genres like poetry and drama. Other genres, such as the epic, which cannot be renewed in that way, become stagnant and cannot exist beyond their old formal structures and ideological content, except in partial imitation within other genres like the novel or the drama. In this specific genre of the epic, which can be characterised as being monologic, it is only the official voice of the state or the historian in the society for which is written that is allowed to express itself. The chorus in *Henry* V, the final play in the Henriad, resembles the traditional epic form in the sense that it extols the ruler from the point of view of an idealistic poet-historian who even compares the ruler to a god in the grand old epic style with its long monologues. Yet the chorus in all its impressiveness becomes just another perspective on power relationships in the play when it is compared to the depiction of the action in the play. Ironically, the monologic voice of the epic now seems to contribute to the dialogising or novelising of the dramatic genre, which can now present us with a more complex perspective on power relationships.

Renaissance carnival writing is another example of ways in which the other voices in society that are opposed to the official voice of the state can be expressed. This could also be seen as a way to create a dialogue between different voices in society that would not interact so freely in other circumstances, as with the manifestation of heteroglossia or 'many-voicedness' in society and in the novel. Is carnival writing a precursor of the modern novel, or is it a phenomenon that helps to novelise or dialogise genres like drama in the renaissance? It is interesting to note that Bakhtin cites the novels of Rabelais as the most important example of carnival writing. Other examples of carnival writing can also be seen in the works of dramatists like Shakespeare in parts of the Henriad, as well as *The Tempest* and A *Midsummer Night's Dream*, and Ben Jonson in *Bartholmew Fair*. However, we must first look at the concept of carnival in more detail, and then at its effect on the representation of power relationships in the Henriad. In my discussion of *The Tempest* I will also show how a typical carnivalesque situation can be an indication of certain shifts in power relationships and eventually lead to the restoration of the status quo in the attempt to contain potentially subversive elements.

In a situation of carnival the traditional order and hierarchies are temporarily reversed in the context of the holiday spirit. This happens in some of Shakespeare's comedies, as well as in certain comic sequences in Shakespeare's tragedies, histories and the romances when people from the lower levels of society are given the power to step into a dialogic relationship with those people who traditionally hold power over them. Although it is a temporary situation in which chaos seems to reign, it can help to provide an alternative perspective on the established power structures and to bring balance to the network of power relationships that are presented in the play by showing certain forms or manifestations of power that people from the lower classes might possess on a personal or even on a social level. In this case we can see how they stand in a relationship of power to people from the middle and upper classes on a social level. A relationship has been established between them by their participation in discourse or dialogue. That relationship also functions on a political level, but even among the upper and middle classes there are already certain established power structures and interactive relationships in which the search for harmony and the desire for domination can clash.

The festive spirit and the element of play that are characteristic of carnival and its transitory nature serve as a way of containing the potentially subversive effect of the practices of reversal and substitution, for instance, in temporary role reversals, that are also characteristic of carnival. By creating a reversal in power relationships and the process of substitution we are provided with an alternative perspective to the official one on the working of power relationships in society, even if the status quo is often restored in the end. The Henriad contains many elements of Bakhtin's concept of carnival, which I will use to look at power relationships in my analysis of these plays.

In the Henriad, which forms part of Shakespeare's sequence of English chronicle or history plays, he represents power relationships not only from what could be seen as the point of view of the state or the official historian, but also from an unofficial or carnivalesque perspective. The carnivalesque elements in Shakespeare's plays form a part of the so-called carnival writing of the Renaissance, which is epitomised in the novels of Francois Rabelais according to Mikhail Bakhtin. This type of writing draws on the rich metaphoric life of the medieval festive tradition of carnival with its grotesque images of the body and bodily functions and the reversal of traditional spiritual and social hierarchies. Although the temporary reversals in power relationships that are associated with the tradition of carnival are potentially subversive in nature, its spirit of playfulness and its association with holidays, which give it a transitory nature, give it positive, renewing force.

In his book-length study of the concept of carnival entitled *Rabelais and His World*, Bakhtin refers to several traits that are inherent to carnival writing. In the first place, he refers to the mode in which carnival writing is written as "grotesque realism". He describes "grotesque realism" as a literary mode that flowered as "a system of images created by the medieval culture of folk humor" that reached its summit in the literature of the Renaissance (31). According to Bakhtin, "the essential principle of grotesque realism is degradation" (19). He defines this degradation as "the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract...a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity" (19-20).

As a social or cultural phenomenon, carnival could also be seen as a temporary reversal in the physical and spiritual order that would seem degrading to the official institutions of society, such as the church and the state. It is symbolised by ritualistic

practices of substitution and role reversals that are often associated with temporary reversals in the religious and political order in society. The transitory nature and the festive spirit or the element of play inherent in carnival contains its potentially subversive and degrading effect on power relationships and authority in general, and kingship in particular as it can be seen in Shakespeare's Henriad.

An example of this type of degradation is the language of carnival, which is also known as the familiar speech of the marketplace or "billingsgate" that consists of ambivalent abuse. While this abuse was "humiliating and mortifying", it "revived and renewed" at the same time (16). In Hal/ Prince Harry's relationship with the physically grotesque figure of Falstaff, who could be seen as a representative of carnival in the Henriad, they often speak to each other in familiar, yet abusive terms with a strong ambiguous undertone.

Banquet imagery, grotesque images of the body, and more specifically images of the lower bodily stratum are also typical of carnival writing. The idea of degradation is also connected to the grotesque images of the body, which emphasises the reproductive areas, eating, drinking and defecating, and the cycles of life and death, or life in death. Death itself becomes a source of new life as opposed to a purely destructive force that negates life. Life is regenerated or renewed in death. Everything, including the body, is in a state of transformation or becoming, as opposed to the proportionate lines and the finalised forms of the classical imagery that are used in the official representations of the world. One could for instance contrast the ambiguous, often sensuous images in the description of Falstaff's death scene with its references to the creation of new life in death, as opposed to the formality of King Henry IV's death scene with its sense of finality in its formality. Yet the rules of succession of kingship also imply continuity in the institution or the spiritual body of the king, as opposed to the transitory nature of the physical body of the king. A break in this continuity would be seriously subversive to the authority of the king. In life and death the portrayal of these two contrasting figures, who represent fatherhood to Hal/ Prince Henry in different ways, and what they represent, can provide us with an alternative perspective on kingship and the way in which power relationships function.

The images of carnival are also typically "sensuous" in nature and have a "strong element of play", which give it a strong resemblance to "certain artistic forms, namely the spectacle". Yet carnival is not an "artistic form" or "a spectacle". It rather belongs to the "borderline between life and art", and could even be described as "life itself...shaped according to a certain pattern of play" (Bakhtin, *Rabelais* 7). Carnival is ambivalent in its status as a social phenomenon on the one hand, and a form of writing on the other. Yet in both these contexts it says much about the social environment in which it exists, and can sometimes even cause one to question the status quo in power relationships.

Falstaff often takes part in the practices of substitution and role reversal, which are typical of carnival and form part of its pattern of play. He is always playing a role in his interaction with the prince and his other companions, and seems to be able to talk himself out of any potentially dangerous situation. He even pretends to be dead when things become too hot for him, and then stages an apparently miraculous transformation scene. In the scenes where he temporarily plays the role of the king and the prince, the potentially degrading or subversive effect on the image and authority of the king can be contained in its spirit of playfulness. In that context he resembles the carnival king or Lord of Misrule that was crowned for one day during the yearly carnival festivities as part of an old folk ritual. The grotesqueness of his body, of which his protruding belly is the most prominent feature, contributes to his image as a carnivalesque figure. He also resembles the clowns or fools who are "characteristic of the medieval culture of humor", and served as the "constant, accredited representatives of the carnival spirit in everyday life out of carnival season" (Bakhtin, *Rabelais* 8). They often feature in Shakespeare's tragedies and comedies, presenting us with an alternative perspective on the issues that are represented in those plays.

In the beginning of the Henriad, Hal seems to immerse himself in the element of carnival in his interaction with Falstaff and his companions, but he always keeps a critical distance between them and himself. His association with these carnivalesque-type figures could be seen as a holiday period before he has to resume his responsibilities as future king, but it also presents him with the opportunity to gain an alternative perspective on kingship and help him to find ways to strengthen his rule in

future. From the beginning of the play, the prince makes it clear to the audience that he will reject Falstaff at his accession to the crown. On the one hand Falstaff's presence as a favourite in the court would be truly subversive to Prince Henry's authority as future king. On the other hand a sudden change in behaviour, or a conversion from misrule to right rule would enhance his image and strengthen his authority as king. This becomes clear in the "I know you all" speech (*1 Henry IV* 1.2.193-215) and in his interaction with his father, King Henry IV, who would be the representative of the official voice of law and authority in this case.

From the beginning Henry IV has to deal with subversive threats to his authority in the form of rebellion and civil war by those who question his right to the throne, but he perceives the current behaviour of Prince Harry/ Hal, his future heir and successor to the throne as a greater threat if it is indicative of his future style of rule. Although the prince occasionally strives to prove his worth as a leader in battle, the king does not know if his carnivalesque behaviour is a temporary holiday-situation, or a permanent character flaw that will negate everything that Henry IV stood for during his reign once Hal/ Prince Harry accedes to the crown as Henry V.

King Henry IV has to struggle to legitimate his rule throughout his reign because of the way in which he came to be king. He bases his authority on his strict adherence to the rule of law, which makes him the official representative or voice of the state not only in his position as king, but also in his style of rule. It is especially important to keep up this appearance because of the doubts that existed about his rights to the throne. Therefore it is especially important that he should contain any possible subversive threats to his authority, even if it makes his relationship with his son very difficult. At the same time, he represents the official voice of the state to his son, who also establishes a dialogue with other voices in society, like Falstaff and his carnivalesque companions, as well as the drawers in the tavern that they frequent. In this way, Hal/ Prince Harry establishes dialogic relationships with his future subjects, and gains knowledge that will strengthen his rule as king at a later stage. He is constantly redefining his role as future king in *1* and *2 Henry IV*. In the final act of the latter play, and throughout *Henry V*, the play that concludes the Henriad, he combines aspects of his father's style using the rule of law with aspects of play from his former association with the carnivalesque to strengthen his rule where necessary.

Both Henry IV and Hal/ Prince Harry, who later becomes king Henry V, are involved in the pattern of legitimation, subversion and containment, and deal with it in different ways. Although Henry V seems more successful in his attempts to legitimate his authority and to contain any possible subversive threats to it through establishing sound power relationships, there are always other forms of resistance to authority that vary in scope that cannot be contained. His rejection of Falstaff and his companions does not nullify their existence, and his war on France in an attempt to unify his English subjects, together with his harsh punishment of traitors, do not prevent any future attempts to take the throne away from his heirs.

The same pattern of attempts to legitimate authority, the creation or perception of possible subversive threats to authority and attempts to contain these threats can also be traced in the representation of power relationships in *The Tempest*. Shakespeare presents us with a heteroglot society in the play in which different voices are shown to be in a dialogic relationship with each other. Elements of the carnivalesque can also be traced in the play, especially in the scenes where Stephano, the butler, and Trinculo, the jester, interact with Caliban, the grotesquely shaped servant of Prospero. These scenes involve grotesque images and physical comedy, and attempts to undermine social hierarchies by the processes of inversion and substitution of traditional hierarchies and official power structures. In any other context these processes would seem threatening.

Prospero himself is shown to have knowledge of different forms of discourse, which could present him with different forms of power on different levels. Although his accomplishment in different forms of discourse initially clashed when he neglected the one in favour of the other, he can now use his authority in one in order to re-establish his authority in the other. His pursuit of the knowledge of magic in Milan resulted in the original usurpation of his authority by his brother. After years of exile on the island he can now use his knowledge of magic to re-establish his authority on a political level and to take his dukedom back from his brother, even if he is eventually going to reject magic.

On the island he uses similar mechanisms of power, such as surveillance and display, but with a magical slant, to those used by the Duke in *Measure for Measure* in order to re-establish the proper set of power relationships and to contain possible

subversive threats to the proper authority in Naples and Milan. The two cities will now be united and made stronger through a marriage between his daughter Miranda, who is also the heir to his dukedom, and Ferdinand, the son and heir to the King of Naples, whose brother also attempted to usurp his position.

In my analysis of *The Tempest* I will show how one can successfully combine elements of the theories of Bakhtin and Foucault in an analysis of power relationships by examining the different manifestations of discourse and the dialogue between different voices in society, or people in different positions in the power structures that are presented to us in these plays. In this play we are presented with different forms of disturbances in power relationships and temporary reversals in the social and political hierarchy. All the attempts to subvert authority seem to be contained toward the end of the play, but the silence of his brother, Antonio, who originally subverted his authority and usurped his position as Duke, remains ominous.

In the network of power relationships in Shakespeare's dramas, we can see how the manifestations of power in different forms and on different levels can affect each other. Knowledge of different discourses, which are sources of power in various forms on different levels, could strengthen the power of the possessor of that knowledge unless he favours the wrong form of discourse. Aspects like the strength, legitimacy and effectiveness of the power of people in authoritative positions depends on the validity and integrity of their source as well as their own integrity and control, and the extent to which they have access to the source of their power. If their knowledge or other source of power is limited to one level or a few levels or forms of power, this could limit their power in conflict situations.

The question in many of Shakespeare's plays remains: can the figures in power successfully legitimate their claims to authority and contain any possible subversive threats to their authority, or will they be overcome by their own weaknesses? In each of Shakespeare's dramas we find a different answer. Yet within the context of the network of power relationships in each play we can see the development of his thoughts on power relationships throughout his work. Each play can provide its own answer in terms of the questions that it asks. The theories of people like Foucault and Bakhtin can guide our analyses of power relationships in the plays under discussion.

Chapter 2

Playing at Rule and Misrule: Concepts of

Carnival and Kingship in Shakespeare's Henriad

Shakespeare's English chronicle history plays are part of an attempt to represent national history aesthetically during the late Elizabethan era. Therefore, they are often concerned with questions surrounding power relationships, and more specifically with questions of rule and misrule, conflict and power struggles. These conflicts or power struggles could take place within a family, a society, among different factions in the monarchy, in the context of a rebellion or civil war, or between different nations or rival monarchies. The plays in the second tetralogy, including *Richard II* and the Henriad, also deal with more specific issues concerning power relationships like the role of the king, his authority and legitimacy, as well as rebellion and treason against him, which are linked to the idea of conflict and power struggles.

In the Henriad itself Shakespeare does not only represent history and power relationships from the official point of view of the state or the national historian, but also from an unofficial or carnivalesque perspective. The official world of the court and the unofficial or carnivalesque-type world of the tavern are set off against each other in *1* and *2 Henry IV*. The only place where the inhabitants or representatives of these two worlds can meet officially is on the battlefield. The figure of Hal/ Prince Harry, who later becomes King Henry V, is the central character in the Henriad, and he belongs to both of the above-mentioned worlds. He is also the only character who can move freely between these two worlds.

In *1* and *2 Henry IV* he is constantly attempting to redefine his role as future king, not only in terms of the official ideologies of the state, but also in terms of carnival. This provides us with an interesting double perspective on power relationships in general, and kingship in particular. This double perspective is informed by his relationship to his real father, King Henry IV, who represents the official world of the court or the state, and his pseudo father figure, Falstaff, who represents the unofficial or carnivalesque world of the tavern.

In *1* and *2 Henry IV*, Henry IV and Falstaff could also be seen as the embodiment of the principles of Rule and Misrule. In the context of the ritual conflict or battle between Carnival and Lent, which forms a part of the medieval festive traditions of carnival, Falstaff would represent the former, and Henry IV the latter. Each of them would then try to influence the Prince permanently when he becomes king. Will King Henry IV's claims to the crown through the institution of right rule be justified by the rule of his heir and successor, and will his authority as king be established permanently after his often-contested rule, or will Falstaff have a permanent influence on and become a favourite with the new king?

A third perspective is created in *1 Henry IV* when Hal/ Prince Harry is compared to the figure of young Harry Percy or Hotspur, who is associated with the rebels against King Henry IV. Ironically Henry IV, who represents the official point of view of the state, sees Hotspur as opposed to Hal/ Prince Harry as the ideal son or potential ruler (*1 Henry* IV 1.1.77-90). In a comparison between these two "sons" it becomes difficult to distinguish which one of them represents Rule, and which one represents Misrule. Falstaff sees Hotspur according to a carnivalesque point of view, which questions the validity of the chivalric values and ideals that he (Hotspur) lives for and are so admired by King Henry IV, but makes him lose sight of common sense at the same time. He (Hotspur) is then also ridiculed by Falstaff, who sees him as a foolish slave of outdated ideals, which unnecessarily stands in the way of comfort and personal safety.

Falstaff states his policy on the battlefield at the sight of the dead Harry Percy: "The better part of valour is discretion" (*1 Henry* IV 5.4.118-119). He not only inverts the order of the words of this well-known saying or words of wisdom, but he also inverts their meaning by making cowardice disguised as discretion a virtue. Falstaff also intends to stab the dead body again so that he does not rise from a "counterfeit" death as Falstaff himself did. Falstaff's "counterfeit" death in cowardice also serves as a foil to Hotspur's heroic death. In the same way the description of Falstaff's "tragic" death, which is filled with sexual innuendo that undercuts the religious references in the beginning of *Henry V*, is a parody of King Henry IV's death at the end of *2 Henry* IV. Even death can be seen from both a carnivalesque and an official point of view in the Henriad. In this way we can see the double aspect of

death, which could be seen as being a final end to life, at the same time that it can be seen to accompany or even engender new life. The prince's point of view on the above-mentioned matters is indicative of the way in which he merges the official point of view of the state and the alternative perspective that carnival provides which will later strengthen his rule as king in Henry V.

Prince Harry does measure his own sense of valour according to his namesake Harry Percy or Hotspur, but can keep a critical distance and win new honour for himself in the eyes of his father and the world of the court, if only temporarily, on the battlefield. The physical and mental battle between these two young men could also be seen as a dramatisation of the battle between Carnival and Lent. Although Prince Harry looks like the representative of Carnival as opposed to Hotspur, who would then be the representative of Lent in terms of values, Prince Harry's skill and sense of military discipline also identify him with Lent, and Hotspur's vigour and his intention to subvert the prince's authority give him certain carnivalesque characteristics. Prince Harry is also torn between the forces of Carnival and Lent in his relationship to Falstaff and Henry IV.

Throughout the Henriad it also becomes clear that the concepts of carnival and kingship are both involved in questions of rule and misrule. According to David Bergeron in his article entitled "*Richard II* and Carnival Politics", there is a "basic tension in carnival...between political stability and subversion" (35). In Shakespeare's second tetralogy of history plays, including *Richard II* and the Henriad, one can see how a similar tension comes to the foreground around the concept of kingship when power struggles and/ or ideological clashes about the definition of kingship take place within the ruling class. Although the concept of carnival is usually implicated in power struggles between people from different classes, its implications can also be extended to describe power struggles within the same class, as Bergeron illustrates in the above-mentioned article. I will use Bakhtin's theories on carnival as it is set out in his book, *Rabelais and his World*, as a guideline for my discussion of the concept, although it will be mediated by references to other texts.

In a state of carnival the "basic tension" between "political order" and "subversion" or rule and misrule would manifest itself in the mock battle between the vigorous and hearty, but indulgent carnival king or Lord of Misrule and the more

abstinent, or conservative and disciplined, representative of Lent. As a holiday, the state of carnival is transitory by nature and containable within the greater order of the year. In the texts of carnival, its subversive effect on the established set of power relationships can then also be contained within the greater order of the state.

The "rituals of revolt" could be said to "coexist with serious questioning of the social, political and religious order", even if the ritual could not always "contain the protest" (Bergeron 34). If misrule is institutionalised, it might become a threat: "Any society that indulges carnival takes some risk...it lays itself open to a kind of mockery that if carried to extremes would be subversive: the clown would indeed become king" (35). He also uses Bakhtin's work as a starting point for his analysis of *Richard II* in his article entitled "*Richard II* and Carnival Politics." He sites the deposition scene as a specific example where "the problem of misrule becomes explicit, prominent, theatrical and carnivalesque." It is a case of "serious *play*" in a "*serious* play*" (35). In this scene, which becomes almost farcical, one wonders, "Who is the king?" and "Who is the beggar?" (35).

The plays of the Henriad also move between the idea of serious *play* and *serious* play, individually or internally and as a group. They have both *playful* or comical, and *serious* or tragic elements. In *1 Henry IV* there is a strong element of playfulness. *2 Henry IV* is more of a mixture of playful and tragic elements. Although *Henry V* does contain certain comic and tragic elements, it also gains a sense of epic scope and romance. Even here, one can see how the young king keeps a sense of the carnivalesque together with the sense of the serious responsibilities of kingship. He plays the role that befits the situation in his eyes, or those of the epic historian. Interestingly, the chorus and the dialogue provide two perspectives on the action of the play, although the focus remains on the roles that the king plays, and the roles that the actors play.

In his book on Rabelais, Bakhtin refers to certain traits that are inherent to carnival writing in the Renaissance. The mode in which it is written is called grotesque realism, which flowered as "a system of images created by the medieval culture of folk humor" that reached its summit in the literature of the Renaissance (Bakhtin, *Rabelais* 31). The language is the familiar speech of the marketplace that consists of ambivalent abuse. While this abuse was "humiliating and mortifying", it "revived and

renewed" at the same time (16). Banquet imagery, grotesque images of the body, and more specifically images of the lower bodily stratum were also typical of carnival writing. These carnival images are typically "sensuous" in nature and have a "strong element of play", which gives them a strong resemblance to "certain artistic forms, namely the spectacle". Yet carnival is not an "artistic form" or "a spectacle". It rather belongs to the "borderline between life and art", and could even be described as "life itself...shaped according to a certain pattern of play" (7).

Prince Harry/ Hal's interaction with the tavern folk, and more specifically with Falstaff, in *1* and *2 Henry IV* is filled with the grotesque imagery and festive spirit that is typical of the carnival writing of the Renaissance. According to Bakhtin, the novels of Rabelais typify this kind of writing, which can also be seen in the works of dramatists like Shakespeare in parts of the Henriad, as well as *The Tempest* and A *Midsummer Night's Dream*, and of Ben Jonson in comedies such as *Bartholmew Fair*.

Falstaff often takes part in the practices of substitution and role reversal, which are typical of carnival and form part of its pattern of play. The grotesqueness of his body, of which his protruding belly is the most prominent feature, contributes to his image as a carnivalesque figure. He also resembles the clowns or fools that are "characteristic of the medieval culture of humor" and served as the "constant, accredited representatives of the carnival spirit in everyday life out of carnival season" (8). They are also constant features in Shakespeare's tragedies and comedies, and present us with an alternative perspective on the issues that are represented in those plays.

Falstaff, who often indulges in what would be seen as vices in a medieval or Renaissance context, also resembles the figure of the Vice in the medieval morality plays. The Vices tempt the protagonist to lead a sinful life, and provides an alternative perspective on life as opposed to the Virtues, which are supposed to steer the protagonist in the right direction. The opposition or conflict between Rule and Misrule or the figures of Carnival and Lent could then be seen as similar to that between the Vices and the Virtues. In *1 and 2 Henry IV* Falstaff and King Henry IV's opposing attempts to influence the future king, Prince Harry/ Hal, could then also be seen as similar to the attempts by the Vices and the Virtues to influence the protagonist representing human beings in general.

Bakhtin refers to "degradation" as the "essential principle of grotesque realism". He defines it as the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract;...a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity" (Bakhtin, *Rabelais* 19-20). The temporary inversion in both the physical and the spiritual order that leads to the above-mentioned practices of substitution and role reversal is often associated with temporary reversals in the political order. It is the transitory nature and the festive spirit or the element of play inherent to carnival that contains its potentially subversive and degrading effect on power relationships and authority in general, and potentially of kingship. In the "I know you all"-speech in the beginning of *1 Henry* IV (1.2.192-214) Prince Harry/ Hal states that he "will awhile uphold/ The unyoked humour of [their] idleness" (192-193), referring to Falstaff and his companions from the tavern. His ultimate intent is to reject them when he becomes king and to change his image. Towards the end of *2 Henry IV* Hal/ Prince Harry, who has just become king, rejects Falstaff and his companions in a way that puts them in the context of carnival as seen from the official point of view.

Falstaff is described as "a fool and jester" with "white hair" that "ill...becomes" him (*2 Henry IV* 5.5.51), and who is "surfeit-swelled,...old, and...profane" (53). He describes his meeting with this man as a "dream" that he despises now that he is awake (52, 54). The image of dreaming and awakening refers to the transitory nature of his association with Falstaff and his companions, whom he now banishes from his presence "on pain of death" (66). As with carnival, there is now a need to be a return to the conventional order of things, especially now that the prince has become a king, and must take responsibility for the welfare of the state.

Up to this point Falstaff has been the representative of the carnival spirit in his relations to Hal/ Prince Henry who has now become King Henry V. Yet, according to the new king, his white hair disqualifies him from being what would be considered an "appropriate" representative of carnival spirit in everyday life, namely the "fool" or "jester". On the other hand, a description of Falstaff's physical appearance reminds us of the image of the grotesque body that Bakhtin describes as being typical of carnival. Further on in the rejection speech, Henry describes Falstaff in a way that makes him a typical figure of carnival when he describes him as "The tutor and the feeder of [his] riots" (65) in the past. He now starts to lecture Falstaff on how he

should turn away from carnivalesque practices and change his life in a way that would be more suitable to his age and his position in society:

> Make less thy body hence, and more thy grace;
>
> Leave gormandising; know the grave doth gape
>
> For thee thrice wider than for other men (55-57).

The images and terminology that King Henry V uses to describe and lecture Falstaff here are typical of the tradition of carnival and of carnival writing. He appropriates the carnivalesque strategy of inversion for official purposes, which enables him to retain certain aspects of carnival that could help to strengthen his rule. It also enables him to contain the potentially subversive effects of carnival by rejecting the negative aspects of carnival. He starts by distancing himself from the world of carnival, even while admitting his former involvement with that world:

> Reply not to me with a fool-born jest.
>
> Presume not that I am the thing I was,
>
> For God doth know, so shall the world perceive,
>
> that I have turned away my former self;
>
> So will I those that kept me company.
>
> When thou doth hear that I am as I have been,
>
> Approach me, and thou shalt be as thou wast,
>
> The tutor and the feeder of my riots (58-65).

He continues by distancing himself forcibly from his old companions, but he also announces measures to keep them from rebelling against him because of personal suffering:

> I banish thee, on pain of death,
>
> As I have done the rest of my misleaders,
>
> Not to come near our person by ten mile.
>
> For competence of life I will allow you,
>
> That lack of means enforce you not to evils;
>
> And as we hear you do reform yourselves,

> We will, according to your strengths and qualities,
>
> Give you advancement (66-70).

Throughout this speech it becomes clear that the young king is playing the role that he thinks will enhance his image as king and strengthen his authority. Although he claims not to "know" the "old man" (50) standing in front of him in the beginning of the speech, it becomes clear that he does know him in the rest of the speech. Although he appears to distance himself now for the first time from that world in the eyes of the public, he already started to distance himself from that world in the "I know you all"-speech (*1 Henry IV* 1.2.192-214). It is his professed knowledge of that world, together with his required knowledge of the official world of the state and the court that enables him to distance himself from the two worlds and to cultivate an alternative perspective on kingship that incorporates aspects from both of these worlds.

When the young king Henry V rejects Falstaff and his companions (*2 Henry IV* 5.5.41-76) and adopts the Lord Chief Justice as a new pseudo-father-figure (*2 Henry IV* 5.2.62-145), he seems to reject his old carnivalesque lifestyle and to adopt the disciplined style of rule that was advocated by his father. Henry IV feared that his son would become prone to favouritism and misrule like King Richard II. Henry V's right s to the throne by means of primogeniture as the son of the king would already be more acceptable. However, if he instituted misrule instead of right rule, it would erase any of the original claims that his father had to the throne as a bringer of justice and a proponent of right rule.

In *Henry V* one can see how the king adopts selected aspects of carnival and his father's style of disciplined rule in order to strengthen his authority as the new king. King Henry IV's rule was always contested because of the way in which he came to power. His constant encounters with rebellion and civil war made it impossible for him to lead a campaign to the Holy Land, as he always intended to do. On his deathbed, King Henry IV counsels his son, Prince Harry, the future Henry V, to "busy giddy minds/ With foreign quarrels" (*2 Henry IV* 4.5.213-214). Henry V's French campaign seems to follow from this advice, or at least from this line of policy, which could help to strengthen his authority, and unite most of his subjects against a

common enemy, instead of following those who would rebel against him or subvert his authority as king.

Although King Henry V adopts certain aspects of his father's policy that would strengthen his authority and reinforce his position as king, he is aware of its weaknesses because of his temporary immersion in the world of carnival that could lend him a certain measure of objectivity. He also adopts certain aspects of carnival in order to strengthen his rule, although he rejects its potentially subversive side, which includes lawless or criminal behaviour and disrespect for the law, the state and the king. One important element that he does retain is the element of play that is essential to carnival.

The element of play in carnival could be set to help form or define the carnival spirit, although it could not be limited in this way. In the context of carnival, play can take on many forms. Falstaff is always seen to be engaged in some form of play. He often engages in word play, in which he can only be mastered by Hal/ Prince Harry, who later becomes King Henry V. As king he uses this skill to see into the subtleties of words and language use in general. This can be seen in his the way in which he handles the Dauphin of France's mocking answer to his challenge to the throne of France and the way in which he entraps the traitors through the use of their own words.

King Henry V wants to extend his authority by claiming the dukedoms in France as part of his birthright. The reply that he gets from France is not from the king himself, but from the Dauphin who takes neither him, nor his claims seriously. Henry V already consulted certain clergy on the validity of his claims, and is not revelling as the French Prince claims. The Prince undermines his authority as a king by referring to his past and sends tennis balls as a "treasure" (*Henry V* 1.2.255, 258) in exchange for the territories that he claimed.

Henry V accuses the Prince of endangering his father's kingdom by challenging his authority in such an insulting manner. He warns that he will "play a set/ Shall strike his father's crown into the hazard" (261-262) and that "he hath made a match with such a wrangler/ That all the courts of France will be disturbed/ With chases" (264-266). He also warns that he is aware of the references to his past with the words:

...we understand him well,

How he comes o'er us with our wilder days,

Not measuring what use we made of them.

We never valued this poor seat of England,

And therefore, living hence, did give ourself

To barbarous license—as 'tis ever common

That men are merriest when they are from home (266-

272).

He continues to state his determination and his willingness to exert himself in order to gain the territories in France. At the same time he inverts the terms of the mocking answer that the Dauphin sent him to turn a game of carnival into an official war for territory:

...tell the Dauphin I will keep my state,

Be like a king, and show my sail of greatness

When I do rouse me in my throne of France.

For that have I laid by my majesty

And plodded like a man for working days,

But I will rise there with so full a glory

That I will dazzle all the eyes of France,

Yea strike the Dauphin blind to look on us.

And tell the pleasant Prince this mock of his

Hath turned his balls to gunstones, and his soul

Shall stand sore chargèd for the wasteful vengeance

That shall fly from them—for many a thousand widows

Shall this mock mock out of their husbands,

Mock mothers from their sons, mock castles down;

Ay, some are yet ungotten and unborn

That shall have cause to curse the Dauphin's scorn.

But this lies all within the will of God,

To whom I do appeal, and in whose name

Tell you the Dauphin I am coming on

To venge me as I may, and to put forth

My rightful hand in a well-hallowed cause.

...and tell the Dauphin

His jest will savour but of shallow wit

When thousands weep more than did laugh at it (273-296).

The king's appeal to the name of God and the reference to his "rightful hand" and "well-hallowed cause" makes his claim seem official, and serves to emphasise the seriousness of his threats. If he steps out as the winner in the war for the territories in France, these words would also affirm the rightfulness of his cause on an official level. His authority would then not only be established by means of warfare and conquering, but also in the name of a higher authority. He even goes as far as to say to his lords that he would be "No king of England, if not king of France" (2.2.190)

When Henry V deals with the traitors (2.2.12-178), he entraps them by leading them into expressing a need for harsh punishment for someone that was "set...on" by "excess of wine" (41) to "[rail] against [the] person [of the king]" (40). He does not let on that he is aware of their crime at first, and now that they have asked for a harsh punishment for a crime that is much lighter than theirs, they cannot expect any mercy from the king. If he must "be punished" as an "example" (45) to prevent others from following their example, and warns the prince against showing too much mercy, they condemn themselves.

In *1* and *2 Henry IV* Prince Harry/ Hal is mostly immersed in the element of carnival, although he must sometimes prove himself as a worthy successor to the crown on the battlefield or in court. Within that context he could establish a dialogue with the people that would inform his own views on his role as a king, and make him familiar with his future subjects. Whereas he played the role of the "dissolute" Prince at that stage, he must now play the role of the king at the end of *2 Henry IV*, and mostly throughout *Henry V*.

His interpretation of his role as king is greatly influenced by his father, King Henry IV, but also by his interaction with Falstaff. The old king's interpretation of kingship consists of a belief in a disciplined and responsible rule. Falstaff's interpretation of kingship becomes degrading and potentially subversive when he imitates both the

king and the prince, and "advises" the prince first as himself, and then in the role of his father, to hang on to Falstaff even if he rejects all his other companions (*1 Henry IV* 2,4.369-465). As a representative of carnival, he stands for appetite and sensual indulgence and opposes everything the king stands for. In his eyes terms like "good government" could now even include criminal activities like stealing if it meant being governed by the phases of the moon (1.2.27-30). In this way the meaning of many common terms or sayings can be inverted to fit his meaning. When Hal/ Prince Harry thinks his father is dead, he takes the crown in order to relieve him of the weight and cares of kingship, although it seems as if he is only interested in grabbing power and to be Falstaff's version of the ideal king. Yet he can assure his father before he really dies that he is aware of the responsibilities of kingship (*2 Henry IV* 152-353).

At the moment when he becomes King Henry V, he must play the role of king and step away from the world of carnival, even if he adopts certain aspects of carnival in his style of rule in order to establish and strengthen his authority. The dialogue that he established as a prince with the common people when he was immersed in the element of carnival now becomes more strained. This can be seen in the scene where the king disguises himself as a common soldier and tries to explain his role as king to the other soldiers. They do not know his real identity at that stage and rejects his defence of the king's policies and intentions. Even now they differ about the responsibility of the king for the lives and the souls of the soldiers who fight for him (4.1.36-226). It is also interesting to see how a double perspective is created between the epic chorus with its idealistic view of the action, and the representation of the action as it happens in the dramatic action. The presence of the king's old carnivalesque companions in certain scenes also subverts the idealistic expectations created by the chorus.

Henry V now seems more at ease when he negotiates with clergy over political and economic issues, and when he discovers and punishes traitors in his role as a king. He is aware of their shortcomings and their strengths, and takes every opportunity to strengthen his rule and to legitimise his authority as king. In that respect he is much more successful than his father, King Henry IV. He is not tortured by questions of the legitimacy of his rule as his father was, but rather creates his own legitimacy by combining aspects of carnival and Lent in his rule.

In the wooing of the French Princess, Katherine, King Henry V uses elements of carnival positively in order to establish a relationship. His pretence of being a blunt soldier-lover and her quaint but limited knowledge of English makes this a very charming scene. Even though it has officially been agreed between King Henry V and her father, the king of France that they would marry and that his child with her would be the heir to the Kingdoms of England and France, he sets out to win her over. The playfulness of carnival and the role that he plays become a central part of his strategy to win her over to a union that would strengthen his authority in the process. This means that the playful aspect of carnival with which Hal/ Prince Harry familiarised himself before he became King Henry V has now become very useful as a strategy of power.

The new king's successful manipulation of power relationships together with the apparently miraculous transformation that he underwent in the eyes of the world legitimises him in the eyes of most of his peers and the common people. Throughout the Henriad, one can see how the role of the king is being redefined in the context of carnival. One can also see how the fundamental tensions in the concept of carnival are also relevant to the issues concerning kingship it self and power relations in general. At this stage, the dialogue between different voices in society, as in the world of the play, is seen as something important that can be incorporated into the rule of the king or the state by adopting elements of carnival. Yet, this dialogue is still limited in a state where the king can play for popularity, but must keep his distance from the general public in order to maintain his authority as a monarch, who does not have the institutional apparatus of the modern state to subject his subjects.

Chapter 3

The Manipulation of Knowledge and Discourse

as Strategies of Power in *Measure for Measure*

Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* is often classified as one of Shakespeare's problem plays because certain questions are either not resolved in the end, or are not treated in a consistent manner. This form of classification could also be attributed to the fact that the play cannot be fitted precisely into either of the traditional generic categories of tragedy or comedy, and is also known as a tragicomedy. However, as a problem play, many questions are raised that affect the interpretation of the subject matter. The questions that I am looking at in this chapter, concerns the representation of power relationships and the manipulation of knowledge and discourse as strategies of power in this play.

In the course of the play, Shakespeare raises many questions surrounding power relationships and authority that can be analysed from a Foucauldian perspective. In such an analysis I would look specifically at the way in which it deals with issues surrounding the questions of power and the formation of the individual human subject. I would also look at the specific manifestations of different types of discourse that manifest themselves in this play. The relationship between power and knowledge and the way in which discourse determines or reflects knowledge can be manipulated by people in different positions in the power structures or network of power relationships that are represented in the play. The manipulation of knowledge and the perception of truth in discourse could be used to legitimise or subvert authority to varying degrees of success. In this way *Measure for Measure* could also become a study of the strategies that are used by those in power in order to subject other members of society who are under their authority. How do the different members of society interact in relationships of power?

According to Sidney Shanker, "the central problem" that is "examined" in *Measure for Measure*, is "the nature of power, its relationship to authority and to justice" (*Shakespeare and the Uses of Ideology* 125). Another question that emerges in the course of the play is whether the Duke as the legitimate ruler can contain all the

attempts at subversion of his authority, and what mechanisms he resorts to in order to accomplish this goal. One could also look at the question from a different perspective: to what extent is resistance to authority possible in this society, if it is possible in any way? My goal is to examine the different strategies of power that emerge from the representation of power relationships in this play and to work towards a Foucauldian analysis of social practices as they are portrayed in the play, and of the text itself.

Foucault called his method in his earlier works an archaeology of the human sciences and of knowledge. In the later stages of his work, especially during the seventies and eighties, he developed a new method, the so-called genealogical analysis of social practices. He moved from more theoretically orientated work to an interpretative analysis of phenomena like the history of punitive and disciplinary systems and the sexuality of the human subject. During this time, he wrote books like *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* and *The History of Sexuality*, the first of which provide an interpretative analysis of the history of penal and disciplinary systems, and the second of the sexuality of the human subject. He also looks at the formation of discursive practices, which enables the current power structures or established set of power relations to produce knowledge and to establish the official version of the truth. Although he moved on to work on a new conception of ethics concerning technologies of the self or self-formation, I am especially interested in the theories and methods of his genealogical stage as an approach to my analysis of *Measure for Measure*. I am especially interested in the issues that are raised in *Discipline and Punish* and *The History of Sexuality*, since they correspond so strikingly to the themes of *Measure for Measure*.

In *Discipline and Punish* Foucault looks at different forms of discipline and punishment as they are manifested in different epochs. He analyses the microphysics of power as it manifests itself in the legal system in general, and how specific discursive and social practices constitute the individual as an object that can be studied and controlled, both mentally and physically. When it is read together with *The History of Sexuality* it shows how the official structures of society turn the individual into a subject in different ways. Foucault distinguishes between two meanings of the word "subject", which are both applicable in this case: "subject to

someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his identity by a conscience or self-knowledge". He continues to explain that both of these meanings "suggest a form of power that subjugates and makes subject to" ("The Subject and Power" 212).

Measure for Measure also looks at questions on the use of power and the measure of effectualness or ineffectualness of different forms of power as exercised by the sovereign and his deputies. I will specifically look at the phenomena of surveillance as opposed to display, the mechanism of clerical confession as opposed to methods of torture, as well as modern methods of confession, and imprisonment itself as waiting for execution or a method of disciplining the prisoner. Even marriage seems to become a reward, or a form of imprisonment as punishment or a way of social regulation. Other phenomena which correspond to or could be used to question Foucault's hypotheses can also be looked at individually as they occur in the text, but the above mentioned phenomena are the most prominent.

Rigid adherence to the old official discourse of law seems to become ineffectual and the strategies of power used by the Duke to re-legitimise or strengthen his authority seem to be changing. New ways must be found to contain the potentially subversive elements in society, or older ways must be renewed and re-contextualised. The Duke's knowledge of the official discourse of law, and his access to other types of discourse and knowledge enable him to re-establish his authority by controlling and manipulating knowledge and discourse from behind his disguise and to find new ways of disciplining the individual subject

In my interpretative analysis of *Measure for Measure* based on the methods used in Foucault's genealogical stage, I will first look at certain questions concerning power and authority that are raised in the text itself. Then I will look at questions of discourse, which often say something about the relationship between knowledge and power, one of the central issues that Foucault explores in his genealogical stage. At that point I will look at methods of surveillance and confession as they are represented in *Measure for Measure* and conclude my analysis of the text with a look at questions of sexuality and marriage, which are closely related to questions of power in this text as it is, in another form, in the analyses of social practices by Foucault during his genealogical stage.

Measure for Measure engages critically with questions of power and authority in a corrupt state where discipline seems to have lapsed largely because of the ruler's apparent lack of attention to his duties as the main regulator of his society. He also seems to have many conflicts of interest, which he tries to resolve by distancing himself from his position as a ruler and by establishing a seemingly strong deputy in his own place. However, this deputy is also subject to conflicts of interests when his overbearing sense of duty to society and his personal desires become conflicted. The rightful ruler is now required to find a new solution to the crises that arise as a consequence of this situation, and must find new ways to reinforce the established power structures.

In the network of power relationships that is portrayed in *Measure for Measure*, one can see how they function not only repressively from top to bottom, but also from bottom to top. The State and the Church are the two main authoritative institutions in the society of Vienna where the play is set. The Duke places himself in a space between these two sites of authority that work on different levels to discipline, rule and/ or control the society of Vienna. As the Duke moves between the authorial spaces of the church and the state, he makes use of the mechanisms of confession, which is instituted by the church, and of surveillance, by using the anonymity and the special access to spaces like the court, the prison and the nunnery which is granted to him in his position as a visiting low-ranking clergyman. In this way the authority of the state can be re-enforced or endorsed by the church, and vice versa. If they stand in a reciprocating relationship to one another they could be used to enhance each other's images in the eyes of the public and the individual subject. When the Duke is disguised as a clergyman (the disguise and dispersal of state and institutional power), he uses his position to regulate and manipulate state matters from behind the scenes so that he could intervene when and where necessary.

Confession as a manifestation of the pastoral power of the church, which helps it to gain an influence over the mind of the individual subject, becomes a mechanism that would later be secularised, dispersed and hidden as a form of power (exercised by psychiatrists and, more openly, by officers of the law, etc.) in modern society. The institution of the nunnery and the monastery becomes an early example of the types of disciplinary institutions like prisons, schools and hospitals identified by Foucault in

modern society. I will discuss the strategies that the Duke uses to re-establish and strengthen his power in Vienna, as well as to test or review his deputies at a later stage in my analysis of *Measure for Measure*.

The Duke likes to keep out of the public eye and therefore avoid participating in too many spectacles of state. He prefers not to "stage" himself to the "eyes" (*Measure for Measure* 1.1.69) of "the people" (68), even though he [contends that he] love[s] them. He does not "relish well/ their loud applause and *aves* vehement" (70-71) and prefers to go "privily away" (68). He also does not "think the man of safe discretion/ That does affect it" (72-73). As it is later revealed, he also avoided *the spectacle of the scaffold* to a great deal, and in this way neglected the rule of law to a certain extent. The result of this is a society where offences, especially of a sexual kind in "houses of ill repute" run rampant.

The Duke's direct Deputy, Angelo, does not play for popularity, but immediately sets out to execute all offenders against laws which even might have been forgotten or neglected. The Duke goes away under the pretence of having to attend to affairs of state outside the city, but he actually disguises himself as a clergyman in order to sound out the truth about Angelo's disposition. Can he (Angelo) keep to the same personal standards as he expects of the people whom he prosecutes under the law?

In this way the Duke does not relinquish his real power during the time that he is supposed to be away from the city, but manipulates events from behind the scene under the guise of a minor clergyman. In that way the power of the state is already starting to mask itself in the guise of the absent monarch. Monarchical rule and its effectiveness are also questioned in the course of the play, which lend itself to a great extent to a Foucauldian analysis in terms of terminology and subject matter. These questions seem to correspond with the emergence of the modern state as Foucault describes it.

Questions of discourse or the relationship between power and knowledge already come up in the beginning of the play. In Act 1 Scene 1 we encounter a dialogue between Vincentio, Duke of Vienna and the old lord, Escalus, the secondary of Angelo, the Duke's appointed deputy, about the discourse of law and government, in which Escalus is learned, and their upcoming appointment in his place while the Duke

is away. The Duke makes the following speech on "the properties" of "government" and the proven abilities of Escalus:

> Of government the properties to unfold
>
> Would seem in me t'affect speech and discourse,
>
> Since I am put to know that your own science
>
> Exceeds in that the lists of all advice
>
> My strength can give you. The nature of our people,
>
> Our city's institutions and the terms
>
> For common justice, you're as pregnant in
>
> As art and practice hath enriched any that we remember (Shakespeare
>
> *Measure for Measure* 1.1.3-13).

As it is indicated above, the old Lord Escalus is thoroughly initiated in the discourse of law and government, and would make a great statesman. His task is to assist the younger lord, Angelo, who is the Duke's appointed deputy and will be assessed by him (the Duke) during his supposed absence. The question is: how will Angelo, the appointed deputy, perform his task? Will he pass the Duke's test, which is set out as the rest of the dialogue between the Duke and Escalus indicates? Is his stern outward appearance in accordance with the inner reality of his soul?

Duke

> What figure of us think you he will bear? ~
>
> For you must know we have with special soul
>
> Elected him our absence to supply,
>
> Lent him our terror, dressed him with our love,
>
> And given his deputations all the organs
>
> Of our own power. What think you of it?

Escalus

> If any in Vienna be of worth
>
> To undergo such ample grace and honour,
>
> It is Lord Angelo (16-23).

The Duke gives Angelo, with the assistance of the Lord Escalus, the same scope as himself to "enforce or qualify the laws/ as to [his] soul seems good" (65-66). Angelo

seems to be accomplished in the knowledge of law and to live according to the strictest standards. Yet the Duke has a foreknowledge of certain weaknesses in the armour of Angelo as manifested in his conduct towards a woman called Mariana who was betrothed to him. Angelo's powerful position as a nobleman gave him the ability and means to manipulate discourse in such a way that it seemed that she was inconsistent to him when her bridal fortune went down in a ship with her brother and protector. She went into seclusion where the Duke disguised as a clergyman would listen to her confession as to what happened in his disguise as a clergyman. He is thus not only proficient in the discourse of law and government, but also to a certain extent in the discourse of the church as an institution.

The Duke's ability to step into the shoes of a minor clergyman from time to time lends him a certain anonymity with which he can move among his subjects and assess their attitudes towards him and towards the laws of the city. In this way he also meets other manipulators of discourse like Lucio who has little respect for the Duke and the laws of the city. He does help Claudio and Isabella, and seems to respect her to a certain extent, but what his motives for helping them are is not so clear. As a specialist in slander and founder of weaknesses in the discourse of law, Lucio twists every situation so that he could say the worst of others and keep the best image of himself. The only one who can resist and ultimately control his tongue or contain the potential subversive effect of Lucio's twisted use of discourse is the master-manipulator behind the scenes, the Duke of Vienna. Lucio's boast that he could avoid getting executed for making a prostitute pregnant whereas Claudio confessed his single misstep, led the Duke to force him into marriage with a prostitute whom he would never marry willingly because he would be seen as a cuckold, someone who is deceived sexual by his wife, even from before his marriage.

Lucio is associated with the criminal underbelly of society, those members of the lower classes who are associated with sexual transgression, the prostitutes and their pimps. Because Lucio is familiar with the discourse of law, he often employs strategies of evasion. He is also familiar with the informal discourse of the people through his association with the under classes, who does not seem only aware of their own situation, but also of public events like the upcoming prosecution of Claudio as ordered by Angelo, whose rigidity in this case, where he want to make an example, is

seen as ridiculous by them. It is one minor transgression or slip up as opposed to what they do everyday. At that stage the greatest threat to them seems to be the closing down of their houses, which they also seem to evade by moving elsewhere, and the whole idea of making an example through this case fails in the eyes of the populace, at which it was aimed. If they are caught they usually do not face torture and execution, but imprisonment and corporal punishment. It is much more difficult to establish an effective mode of surveillance on them at a stage when the police force was not yet established as an institution. Confession as instituted by the church, which would classify them as sinners in its own clerical discourse, would not be effective. Confession as a means of gathering information about criminal acts would only work under the threat of torture or prosecution by the law. There are distinct forms of discipline that can be seen to develop in this society, but it is not yet a fully developed disciplinary society as in the modern society that Foucault describes.

If the threat of sexual transgression in the lower classes could be contained through certain disciplinary measures, it seems to be a greater threat when it can not be contained within the lower classes or among those outside Viennese society, but is found to happen in the case of someone like Lucio, who can manipulate the discourse of law and informal discourses with other members of his class or the clergy in such a way as to make himself seem better and others seem worse. He slanders the Duke to his face when he is disguised as a clergyman, and can slander this same clergyman, who supposedly comes from outside the city, i.e. an outsider, before the Duke, Angelo and Escalus.

Angelo is the other threatening sexual transgressor, who is potentially even more dangerous than a character like Lucio or the people from the lower classes, especially once the Duke imbues him with power. He knows the truth or part of the truth of Isabella's story when she confronts him because of the way he treated her, and because of the apparent execution of her brother. In spite of all that, he chooses to let them disbelieve her and see Lucio's story of the lecherous outsider-priest who misguided Mariana and Isabella in a plot against him and the Duke as a truth. He seems to be a proper man, and is respected or even ridiculed by all others except the Duke for his strict views on the law and the rigidity of his outlook on life and the way he lives. He is formed by his society and shaped by its discourse, but in the cases of

Isabella and Mariana, whom he uses when it pleases him, he shows the ability to manipulate the official discourse in such a way that he keeps his own spotless reputation, except in being harsh. He lets the outsider, who seems to be a low-ranking clergyman, take the blame as a potential foreign spy. If Isabella's story were not both contested and partially affirmed by Mariana, who told them about the priest, she would have been made out to be a mad woman. The discourse of madness would also have been dismissed as opposed to the official discourse, which would also be seen as the discourse of reason, as it manifests itself in the rule of law.

The fact that the blame could be shifted from him by the use or manipulation of official discourse and the exercise of power indicates a weakness in the power structures of society which is much more dangerous for its potentially subversive use as opposed to the threat by the lower classes or clear-cut degenerates like Lucio who were created as transgressors by the fact of the discourse of law. Yet the fact that subversive potential does not only lie in the higher classes, but also in the lower classes, who could refuse to co-operate with the government and the laws imposed on them shows that power relationships in society do not merely work from top to bottom according to rank and hierarchy, but also from bottom to top, as Foucault often states in his theories and analyses.

According to Foucault's theories knowledge is formed by discourse, which is largely determined by those who are in power. In other words discourse is closely involved in the relationship between knowledge or truth and power. The last scene in *Measure for Measure* also shows how power can determine what is considered to be 'true' knowledge. Throughout the play as well as in this scene it is shown how someone who is knowledgeable in the official discourse can use this ability to promote or protect himself in the network of power relationships in that society, and can affect matters of power, for instance in the form of law and prosecution.

The forms of discipline in society are also determined by its official discourses and enable the Duke to use marriage as a form of social regulation when he determines not to enforce the law by method of execution, when it would clearly be disproportionate or unpractical in certain questions. He is also a great determinant in the discourse of law, and can challenge its interpretation and its terms. Yet he cannot completely dismiss the discourse on which his authority was based in the first place entirely. This

is part of the reason why he uses Angelo as a test case with full power during his supposed absence. His power is also determined to a great extent by the official discourse of his society, which ultimately legitimates his power. He is the one who is at the centre of the network of power relationships, and institutes his own methods of surveillance and hearing confessions in his guise as a clergyman, in order to get closer to the general populace and determine how effective the official discourse is functioning as an aid to the exercise of power, and to try to contain subversions of it where possible.

In his guise as a clergyman the Duke can activate the mechanisms of surveillance and confession. As a minor clergyman he can have access to many places where he can meet his subjects and see the effects of Angelo's rule on them in relative anonymity. The spaces that are portrayed in the course of the play include the central seat of state power, the Duke's palace, the houses of ill-repute where certain members of the lower classes engage in illicit sexual activities and at times discuss the affairs of state, the punitive space of the prison where certain executions take place, and the religious space of the nunnery. The Duke can move among many of these spaces in his disguise as a priest and observe as well as influence events. In this way the power of the state can be combined with the authority of the state in order to find a more effective mode of government. The mechanisms like confession and surveillance that are consequently activated would later be shown to become more diffused and under a deeper disguise in Foucault's analyses of the modern state.

The process of constituting the modern individual as a subject, not just in the sense of being subject to a ruler, is beginning to emerge. The people already show a great awareness of the affairs of state, although much of it is still revealed to them in the form of spectacle with the display and execution of offenders and information from less reputable members of the higher classes like Lucio.

The Duke only reveals his plans in a form resembling a confession to a real clergyman, who then agrees to assist him in his plans. It is important to note that the term confession is still used in a religious framework in the world of the play. It forms part of the discourse of religion, which also manifests itself in the blessings and greetings pronounced by the characters. However, in this case it touches on the discourse of law and government, and would later also touch on the discourse on

sexuality. Confession could also be extracted by force in cases of prosecution by the law, but it would still be put within a partly religious framework, and might not be as truthful as clerical confession. However, the truth of official clerical confession is partly determined by the idea of confidence between the priest and the confessor, and the belief in a higher power of justice. Yet the fact that what is said in the confession must be held secret, adds an air of mystery to the superior knowledge or his apparent foreknowledge of events by the Duke. Yet he also knows when to pretend ignorance, and make a show of the exposition of the truth. It is yet another way of manipulating discourse and reinforcing his power, as well as increasing the extent of his own authority.

Foucault's earlier theoretical expositions and his series of analyses of the history of different social practices help us to differentiate between the different discourses in which the different characters in the play participate. The role of confessor would later be taken over by professionals like psychiatrists and officials in the legal system, who would study the individual as a type of human subject in order to gain knowledge and power. The Duke also uses the knowledge that he gains by means of surveillance and confession to re-legitimise his own power and to contain the most powerfully subversive transgressions in the society under his rule. This shows once again how the interrelation between power, knowledge and discourse can influence the power relationships in society by influencing the perception of power as a construct.

One of the first cases that is presented to the Duke in his disguise as a clergyman is the impending execution of Claudio, an otherwise respectable young gentleman, for the impregnation of Juliet, who was secretly betrothed to him. Unlike Lucio, who denied all charges that were made against him when he impregnated a prostitute, he admits to what could be seen as his offence. Angelo initially wants him to serve as an example for other offenders through his public execution, but even the characters from the lower classes can see that he is more innocent than many characters, who often manage to avoid prosecution more successfully and deviously.

The Duke listens to the confessions of the characters, who confide in him more easily in his guise as a priest, even if they do not officially confess to him. He listens and gives advice so as to manipulate events from behind the scenes. He listens to Isabella, the sister of Claudio who was about to become a nun when she was called in

to plead for her brother's life and to Claudio and some of the other inmates and guards or functionaries in the prison. It is also the space where he becomes acquainted with the loose tongue and morals of Lucio, who uses every opportunity he can to slander every one around him. The only people who seem to be respected by Lucio, are Claudio and Isabella. When they are asked to sacrifice Isabella's chastity for Claudio's life, the Duke sets out to council them secretly from behind the scenes and to influence their actions and interactions in the real world, and to influence court proceedings during Angelo's rule.

The Duke's use of the mechanisms of surveillance and confession enables him to use new methods to use his power and increase its effectiveness where necessary. In that way he can also legitimise his own authority even further, and have grounds to give someone like Angelo legitimate authority, or to prove the illegitimacy of Angelo's authority. Even when the Duke is disguised as a priest he is protected from slander and prosecution in the real authority given to him in his position of Duke. When the Duke's real identity is revealed, he seems to be made a Duke by Lucio. This would seem to be a reversal in power relationships, because Dukes can only be made by kings or by birth, but the Duke is actually re-claiming his position as Duke and re-establishing his own authority after neglecting to enforce it effectively in the past through the agency of people like Lucio and Angelo.

In *The History of Sexuality* Foucault speaks of different stages in the history of sexuality, which is also part of the history of the formation of the individual as a subject. He contrasts the relative openness about sexuality and the body until the seventeenth century with the repressive sense of sexual morality in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, with its climax in the Victorian era. Yet he also shows how discourses about the forbidden subject, sexuality started to abound during that time. He also talks about the link between power and sexuality.

In *Measure for Measure* we encounter a society that is divided about the subject of sexuality. Only a part of society is open about their sexuality. This is the one part of the lower classes with which certain gentlemen like Lucio, who is seen as a degenerate, move. He associates himself with the prostitutes and pimps, who know they could make a living by preying on people like him. Yet he also distances himself from them when it is necessary, for instance, when he denies fathering a prostitute's

child in order to evade prosecution for it, and later when he encounters some of his familiars when he visits his friend Claudio in jail. On the other hand he is associated with the members of the upper classes, who take restrictions on sexuality by law more seriously.

In the respectable part of society, sexuality can only be seen within the framework of marriage or sinfulness. Therefore sexual practices outside the marriage are forbidden by law. Sexual transgressors are seen as sinners who live outside the law, and the scale that this form of transgression has reached in that society seems to merit intervention by law. It is the one solution to which a man like Angelo who tries to bind himself and everyone around him to the letter of the law reaches. Yet his own repressed sexuality stands in the way of his judgement, and makes him even more rigid and uncompromising towards others. This means that a person like Claudio who was on the way to becoming a respectable citizen, is now condemned to death because of one transgression of the law that forbids sexual activity outside the marriage, which could be argued to be minor and be resolved by lesser measures. The discourse of law in relation to sexuality seems to be open to interpretation by those who possess sufficient knowledge of it. The control and manipulation of discourse therefore becomes a very important source of power over the individual subject, who must now find a definition of himself as a subject in the context of that discourse as it manifests itself in methods of discipline and punishment.

At a crucial moment in the play, when Isabella confides in him as a priest about Angelo's indecent proposal, it is revealed that the Duke knows that Angelo rejected a lady who was betrothed to him earlier when her bridal fortune was lost at sea with her brother's ships. Angelo then accused her of inconsistency to him to cover his own materialistic weaknesses. Claudio and his betrothed, Juliet, could not yet marry because they were afraid the keepers of her bridal fortune would not approve of the match, but they intended to do it at a later stage. Would Angelo be willing to set himself the same personal standards? This is one of the many things that the Duke wants to find out through his methods of surveillance.

What he finds out is that Angelo also has his sexual weaknesses, although he tries to suppress it and to deny it for a long time. The duke believes Isabella because of his previous knowledge of Angelo, and sets out to help her and Angelo's betrothed,

Mariana, simultaneously by organising a "bed-trick", which would put Angelo and Claudio effectively on the same level. Isabella would pretend to give in to his sexual demands, but a heavily disguised Mariana would take her place. Angelo hastened Claudio's execution because he was afraid that his weaknesses would be exposed when Isabella seemed to give in to his demands and he heard of the Duke's so-called early return. He was also afraid of retribution from Claudio because of what he did to his sister. It is the passion of Isabella's plea for her brother's life and the seeming impenetrability of her chastity that excited Angelo, who now hastens the execution of Claudio to avoid being challenged by him. His greatest fear is that what would be seen as his personal weakness in the eyes of society would be exposed, but he thinks he can deny Isabella's claims as he denied Mariana's claims before. In this way he becomes an abuser of power, which makes him even more of a threat than other minor, or less important or powerful transgressors.

The weaknesses of the punitive system that consists of imprisonment, whippings and public execution are dramatised very vividly in the course of the play. The Duke, who is also testing its effectiveness by appointing Angelo as his Deputy with full power in his absence, is ultimately searching for a more satisfying alternative. The solutions that he would find in the end are unconventional in modern times, but would seem more viable in that specific historical context, even though some questions would remain as to its ultimate effectiveness. Foucault's picture of a modern disciplinary society is very different, although some of the problems that he deals with must also be faced by the Duke. Since sexual offences seem to be running rampant in Viennese society, the Duke sees that enforced marriage as a form of social regulation would be the best solution in many of these cases, although it could also be exploited by him to a certain extent. On the other hand it does not solve all the problems caused by sexual transgression in the form of a part of the society who lives outside the norms of the law.

In certain cases he is granting the wishes of characters like Mariana, who was betrothed to Angelo, and Claudio and Juliet, while in other cases like that of Isabella, he seems to be forcing them. In the case of Lucio, the "fantastic" who lives between the worlds of the gentlefolk and the deviant part of the lower classes, it is a nightmare come true. He now has to live with the consequences of his loose words and actions,

and live with the dishonour of being made a cuckold or a deceived husband even before he was married because he would now be forced to marry a prostitute who had his child. In the case of Angelo, things would become even more complicated.

The Duke made it seem as if Angelo was to be executed after his marriage to Mariana for the sake of the restoration of her good name and her personal welfare because of the premature execution of Claudio, who would otherwise have been pardoned by the Duke. Yet the Duke already took the jailer into his confidence about his real identity and in that way forestalled the execution of Claudio. Only after all the elaborate disguises and deceptions were cleared up, the names of Juliet and Mariana, who were accused of everything from madness to deliberate lying, and to being misguided by a corrupt priest, were cleared. Lucio, who was already shown to engage very loosely with the truth, except in the case of Claudio and Isabella, is very eager to prove the villainy of the priest by ascribing the slanderous speeches that he made himself to him. However, he was caught in his own lies when the so-called priest was revealed to be the Duke himself. Until that moment truth seemed to be on the side of Angelo in his capacity as the fully empowered deputy of the Duke who could control accepted knowledge and the use and interpretation of all official discourses. Now he would have to surrender it once again into the hands of the rightful ruler, and accept the fact that he would be judged by his own rules, 'measure for measure'.

Angelo seems rigid and strict to the point of hypocrisy, especially when his weaknesses are revealed, but his strong beliefs and uncompromising behaviour are seated in a deeper ambition or the ideal to become the perfect noblemen and official. His strengths and weaknesses were created by the same system into which he was raised. He is already subjected to a great extent by the social and discursive practices of his society, although he is not turned into an object to be studied and controlled in his physical behaviour by the bio-politics of the modern society described by Foucault. His weaknesses, sexually and materialistically, are informed by the weaknesses of his society as they can be observed in the behaviour and opinions of the rest of the characters in the play. The people will not be fooled easily, and will always look for loopholes in the law, even when he applies it so strictly. Those who do not comply with the laws and regulations of their society cannot be given the

agency to affect power structures incisively in this pre-disciplinary society. Ultimately the effectiveness of a ruler depends on the co-operation or acceptance of the whole society, whether it is forced or given willingly. Power relationships can in this context once again be seen to function throughout the whole society, from top to bottom and from the bottom to the top, although there is still a distinct hierarchy of social classes visible.

In my analysis of *Measure for Measure* I have looked at themes that correspond to those one finds in Foucault's work, especially in his genealogical stage. This approach differs considerably from traditional criticisms of the play. My analysis also differs from that made by the cultural materialist, Jonathan Dollimore, in his article entitled "Transgression and Surveillance in *Measure for Measure*", which looks at similar issues, but in a broader cultural context. He also supplements his analysis with certain Bakhtinian theories, which could help to see the structures of society from a wider angle. Bakhtin sees the interaction between the classes and the individuals as a continuous dialogue, an animated form of discourse that also caters for fluctuations in society. The concept of carnival, which implies a temporary reversal of power relationships and contained resistance to power structures, could not precisely be applied to *Measure for Measure*, but it becomes a strong factor in other plays by Shakespeare which deal with power relationships, for instance in the Henriad and The *Tempest*.

The text of *Measure for Measure* lends itself very well to a Foucauldian analysis, especially in terms of the issues that it addresses and the discourse and terminology used in the text of the play. It addresses many of the same issues that Foucault addresses in his work, especially in his genealogical stage, including questions of power in its relation to the individual subject, the relationship between power and knowledge as determined or reflected in discourse, the working of the mechanisms of surveillance and confession to form the individual both as a subject in awareness, and an object of study to be controlled or manipulated, and questions of sexuality and marriage. It is also interesting to note how the workings and mechanisms of certain institutions prefigure other institutions which would later involve in disciplinary societies as described by Foucault. Yet in all the strategies and mechanisms of power that are used in the course of the play, it is the manipulation and control of knowledge

and discourse that informs the individual human subject of his position in the network of power relationships existing in his society.

Chapter 4

Prospero's Choice: Alternative Discourses

and Strategies of Power in *The Tempest*

In *The Tempest* we are presented with a complex network of power relationships in which different forms of power exist at different levels. In the course of the play, power can be seen to take the form of political manoeuvring, monarchical or patriarchal rule, magic and enchantment, the intoxicating power of alcohol, and love and forgiveness, which becomes a powerful force towards the end of the play. Prospero's power to raise the dead as claimed in his renunciation speech with its many references to Ovid's "Medea", seems to be contained in his ability to make people think the others are dead, and reuniting them with the maximum theatrical effect. The only powers that the monster-servant, Caliban, seems to have, are his knowledge of the island and his physical strength. Ironically, he is the son and considers himself to be the rightful heir of Sycorax, the witch who originally ruled the island before Prospero.

These different forms of power are shown to function not only on a social level, but also within families on a personal level, among different classes and types of people in the societies on the island and in the cities, in national and international political power structures and among natural and spiritual forces on a cosmic level. Prospero also stands in a relationship of power to his monster-servant, Caliban, and his spirit servant, Ariel. Although Prospero's island seems to be isolated from the rest of the world, it brings together many elements from and influences the outcome of events in Naples and Milan, the city-states where most of the characters come from.

The Tempest raises many issues concerning power relationships from Shakespeare's earlier plays and explores them from a new perspective, for instance the question of married love and political marriages, which influences the distribution of power and property. The way in which the interaction between the different characters and the results of their actions and decisions are portrayed can provide us with an interesting perspective on the representation of power relationships in Shakespeare's dramas.

At the centre of the very complex network of power relationships with which we are confronted in *The Tempest* is Prospero, the former Duke of Milan and the current ruler of the island. He brings members of the society of the two cities, Milan and Naples, together with members of the society on the island. From the beginning of the play, where power relationships on the ship are reversed during the storm, leaving the Boatswain in charge, it becomes clear that there are many disturbances in the network of power relationships with which we are presented in the play. Prospero is aware of these disturbances from his earlier experiences in Milan where his position as Duke was usurped by his younger brother, and through the agency of the spirit, Ariel, with whose help he can manipulate events from behind the scenes and keep up surveillance of the different groups that are present on the island. In this way he can control events on the island and eventually restore his authority as Duke of Milan, while ensuring his daughter's inheritance. In my analysis of power relationships in *The Tempest* I will look at the ways in which he attempts to restore and re-legitimise his authority and to contain any possible subversive threats to his new-found authority if it is possible. How will he address and possibly restore the disturbed network of power relationships that confronts him?

The Tempest also continues to explore many issues surrounding power relationships in general that were raised in Shakespeare's earlier plays, including "the nature of power and authority" and questions about "political legitimacy and the effects of usurpation" that had "occupied Shakespeare's mind from the earliest history plays to *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*" (Orgel, "Introduction" 5). In order to answer those questions and to analyse the very complex network of power relationships with which we are presented in *The Tempest*, I will have to refer to the theories of Foucault and Bakhtin.

During his stay on the island, Prospero seems to have learned the value of the relationship between power, knowledge and discourse, which also plays an important role in Foucault's theories. In Milan Prospero steeped himself in knowledge of the discourse of the magical arts and neglected his knowledge and control of the affairs of state. Prospero left his powers as a Duke in the hands of his brother, Antonio, who had a great knowledge of the official discourse of state and its laws, and ultimately used it to gain power and usurp his brother's position as Duke and send him

(Prospero) into exile, hoping he would die on the way. On the island the whole dynamic of the network of power relationships changes when the power of magic seems to take precedence over the power of statecraft.

In the course of the play one can see how Prospero's political power or official authority as Duke and head of state in Milan is contrasted with the magical power that seems to be the basis of his authority on the island. Both of these forms of power are appropriate to different locations and seem to be mutually exclusive in one location. Therefore Prospero, the rightful Duke of Milan must ultimately make a choice not only between the island and the city, but also between political or state power and magical power, both of which he has knowledge of.

Prospero's voice now seems to be established as the authoritative voice throughout the play. As he can control the official or dominant discourse and seems to have power over all the other characters in the play, he can also control the narrative of his exile to the island and the history of the island itself. This is one of the ways in which he can legitimise his authority and contain potentially subversive elements in the opposing voices, which could undermine his authority as the ruler of the island. In the end it also helps him to regain his authority as the Duke of Milan. In this way, elements from the theories of both Foucault and Bakhtin become applicable to my analysis of power relationships as it is portrayed in the play.

In his analyses of social practices, Foucault refers to various strategies of power that are used in order to subject the individual in the different epochs that he identifies within his works. These strategies determine the power relationships that exist within society and to subject the individual by controlling his access to knowledge in discourse or disciplining the mind or body. Prospero uses a magical version of some of these strategies, including surveillance (a way of gathering knowledge of events and people) and display (a way of influencing people's mind by dazzling their senses and putting them in awe of his power or making them understand his claims to authority) in order to control his subjects.

Prospero uses his magic to manipulate events and to control the perceptions on those people or groups of people who are stranded on the island. He sends the spirit creature, Ariel, in a storm in order to gather and eventually punish those people who

usurped or supported the usurpation of his power in an awesome display of his magical powers. Afterwards he separates them into groups or individuals who think they are the only survivors and can easily be surveyed and magically manipulated by Prospero through the agency of his spirit-servant, Ariel, who only longs for freedom. On the one hand Ariel tries to resist Prospero's authority, and on the other hand he helps to legitimise that authority and to contain any possible subversive threats. Yet by re-enforcing Prospero's authority one more time he gains his freedom from it.

Towards the end of the play Prospero creates a masque that does not only display his magical powers, but also celebrates the proposed marriage between his daughter, Miranda, who is the rightful heir to the Dukedom of Milan, and Ferdinand, the son and heir of the King of Naples. This is also a sound political strategy that will help to ensure the restoration of power relationships in Milan after they were originally disturbed by the usurpation of Prospero's position as Duke by his brother, Antonio. On the one hand it will strengthen Prospero's authority in his return as the Duke of Milan, and on the other hand it represents permanence and continuity by assuring a line of succession in the marriage between the two heirs. It celebrates the restoration of the deeply disturbed network of power relationships, and of the official hierarchy of the states that can now be renewed and strengthened by an advantageous marital connection.

As I have said before, the way in which the characters are grouped after the storm reflects the social and political structures in most of the characters' cities of origin, Naples and Milan. These groupings also represent the different voices in society that interact with each other and with Prospero in a dialogic relationship. This brings us back to the concept of dialogue, which is such an important aspect of Bakhtin's theories on language and literature. In this dialogue we can also observe the dynamic of the power relationships that exist on the island.

After the shipwreck, Ferdinand the son and heir of Alonso, King of Naples, is separated from his father, each one presuming that the other is dead. He and Miranda, the daughter and heir of Prospero, the rightful Duke of Milan, represent the voice of the younger generation and the future of the two states that will in the end be renewed and strengthened through a match between the two heirs. Alonso is stranded together with Gonzalo, a gentleman who remained loyal to Prospero even after he (Prospero)

was stripped of his political power and sent into exile, as well as his own younger brother, Sebastian, and Prospero's brother, Antonio, the usurping Duke of Milan. The other two members of this party of survivors are two lords, Adrian and Francisco. Together they could be seen as the voice of the upper class in society, although they do not always speak with one voice. This can for instance be seen when the lord Gonzalo describes his ideal commonwealth in which everything would be pure and fruitful, while the cynical and opportunistic lords Sebastian and Antonio are detracting from his innocent words.

This group also thinks they are the only survivors of the shipwreck and that the rightful heir to the throne of Naples is dead. The two younger brothers already conspire to replace Alonso with Sebastian as the King of Naples in the absence of a direct heir. This conspiracy is detected by Prospero through the agency of his spirit-servant, Ariel, and is thwarted by the use of magic and mystical deception. The group as a whole is first tempted by music and the vision of a banquet, but then Ariel takes it away from them in the guise of a harpy. Alonso is also punished for his part in the original conspiracy to expel Prospero by making him mourn what he sees as the death of his only son and heir.

Stephano and Trinculo, the drunken butler and the jester, form the other group of survivors from the shipwreck. In some strange way they came to be in possession of the barrels of wine that were stored on the ship. As servants who represent the voice of the lower classes in society, they quickly meet up with Caliban, Prospero's monster-servant, the son of the witch Sycorax. She originally ruled over the island and enslaved the spirit, Ariel, who only wants to be set free by Prospero. Caliban feels that Prospero took the island from him, and serves him only grudgingly. When he is exposed to alcohol with its intoxicating power, he subjects himself willingly to their "authority" and promises them everything that belongs to Prospero if they would help him to get rid of Prospero. However, in the end he does find out that the "intoxicating power of alcohol" is only an illusion, and that they used him for their own gain. Yet what the butler and the jester use as a form of power over Caliban, puts them in the world of carnival as it is described by Bakhtin in *Rabelais and His World*. Together they try to invert the official hierarchy on the island and to substitute themselves for Prospero as rulers of the island or Lords of Misrule.

When Stephano and Trinculo first meet Caliban, they see him as a grotesque monster. In their interaction with him, the situation soon begins to take on elements of the carnivalesque with the transitory nature of the situation, grotesque images of the body in references to Caliban, and bodily functions like eating and drinking. As a drunken butler, Stephano also gains certain aspects of the carnivalesque in his physical features with a red nose and a big body. As the court jester, Trinculo is supposed to be the representative of the festive spirit of carnival in everyday life. Caliban allows Stephano and Trinculo to become "Lords of Misrule" temporarily in what is for them a festive holiday period in which they thought they could delude themselves into thinking they could reverse the hierarchical order on the island and in society by substituting themselves for the rulers of the island. Activities like reversal and substitution are then also typical of the carnivalesque. Although Prospero manages to contain all their attempts at subverting his authority on the island, Caliban the servant-monster, together with Stephano the drunken butler and Trinculo the jester, who are all from the lower or serving class, manages to provide us with an interesting alternative perspective on the network of power relationships that exist on the island, and in the play as a whole.

The theories of Foucault and Bakhtin could provide us with new perspectives on the network of power relationships that are portrayed in *The Tempest*. This double perspective that is created through a combination of their theories can also guide us in our study of the nature of power and authority as it appears in the plays. It also reminds us of the fact that power is always relational, and that power relations determine and are determined by the interaction between different members of society, and their access to knowledge as contained in discourse. Prospero also has to re-establish his authority over the other members of the temporary new society that was created on the island and by restoring the disturbances in the power relationships that emerged in the course of the play. Although Shakespeare's plays often deal with questions surrounding power relationships, they seem to me the most prominent in the Henriad, *Measure for Measure* and *The Tempest*, which seem very well suited to analyses of power relationships in terms of the theories of Foucault and/ or Bakhtin.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

Power relationships play an important role in Shakespeare's plays. They form part of the dynamic of the interaction between the different characters. As I have stated before, each play consists of a network of power relationships in which different forms of power interact on different levels, and each character has a role in this network. The plays that I have chosen to discuss in this thesis all provide us with certain new perspectives on the representation of power relationships, with which they are particularly concerned, in Shakespeare's dramatic work. In my analysis of these plays it also became clear that each of them are concerned with questions surrounding the nature of power and authority.

The Henriad and *The Tempest* deal with issues like "political legitimacy and the effects of usurpation" that had "occupied Shakespeare's mind from the earliest history plays to *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*" (Orgel, "Introduction" 5). In *Measure for Measure* and *The Tempest* questions of the neglect of rule and its consequences are addressed, as well as the restoration of power relationships that were disturbed as a result of that.

In the Henriad one of the most important questions that are dealt with is the role of the king. From the beginning of this group of plays we are presented with different perspectives on kingship, just as we are presented with different perspectives on power relationships by looking at the different voices from society that find expression in these plays

In the development of Hal/ Prince Harry to the renowned warrior-king, Henry V, one can see how he looks at kingship from different perspectives. At first he seems to participate in potentially subversive carnivalesque activities and to neglect his duties as a prince in his association with Falstaff and his companions. Yet, every now and then he shows his prowess as a soldier in the service of his father, King Henry IV. In the course of the sequence of plays one can see that the prince's carnivalesque activities and his association with Falstaff are only temporary, and help him to determine his role as future king and as actual king in *Henry V*, along with the lessons that his father and his royal staff taught him. He gains a knowledge that helps him to

build his power as a king and find new strategies to legitimise his authority in order to contain any possible subversive attempts against his rule.

In *Measure for Measure* the Duke questions the effectiveness of his own rule and appoints a deputy called Angelo, who seems to be a strict and upright person, whom he would secretly monitor while pretending to be away on state business, in order to evaluate the effectiveness of different strategies of power. These strategies of power corresponds to those that Foucault looks at in books like *The History of Sexuality* and *Discipline and Punish* in the genealogical stage of his work during which he was mainly concerned with the analysis of social practices.

The Duke's manipulation of events from behind the scenes with his strategies of surveillance and confession in order to gain a knowledge that would increase his power, is much more effective than Angelo's strategy of displaying state power by holding public executions and closing down "houses of ill repute" in order to solve the problem of rampant sexual immorality, which he sees as subversive to the authority of the state. Yet the greatest threats to the authority of the state often come from those who hold power when they neglect or abuse their authority. They must not only have knowledge of the official discourse of the state and exercise their powers effectively, but also consider the ways in which their interaction with and influence on their subjects can either reinforce or subvert their own authority.

In *The Tempest* Prospero's authority as a Duke has already been subverted and taken away by his brother, Antonio. In the course of the play Prospero sets out to restore the network of power relationships that were already deeply disturbed before the moment in which the play already starts. On the island his magic gives him authority of those who are native to the island, as well as the groups of people that were stranded there after their ship was wrecked. On the one hand, we can see how he uses Foucauldian strategies of power by gathering knowledge and controlling the perceptions of truth of those who are subjected to him on the island. On the other hand, we can see the interaction or dialogic relationship between the different voices in society as they are represented by the different groupings of the people on the island from a Bakhtinian perspective. Bakhtin's analysis of the concept of carnival with its festive spirit and its temporary reversals in power relationships also provides us with an interesting perspective on the situation in which Caliban wants to help the

drunken butler, Stephano, and the jester, Trinculo to take power on the island. In turn this also creates a further perspective on the network of power relationships that are depicted in the course of the play.

Reversals of the official hierarchies and substitution, for instance, of the carnival king for the real king, are also typical practices of carnival. However, these practices are not limited to situations of carnival. In the Henriad the grotesque figure of Falstaff, who is a typically carnivalesque character, sometimes seems to serve as a substitute for fatherhood and an example for kingship in Hal/ Prince Harry's youth. When the Duke of Vienna questions the effectiveness of his own rule, he appoints a deputy who should serve as a substitute for him while he evaluates the situation. In *The Tempest* the Duke's brother tries to turn a temporary substitution for his brother into a permanent one. Caliban's attempt to substitute the butler and the jester for Prospero in a typically carnivalesque situation is short lived. In each of these cases substitution leads to a reconsideration of power relationships, and sometimes eventually to the restoration of the power relationships that were disturbed originally.

Throughout these plays we can also find the patterns of legitimation, subversion and the containment of potentially subversive elements that often emerge from the literary analyses of new historicists like Stephen Greenblatt who were greatly influenced by the theories of Michel Foucault. Sometimes the creation of the perception of potentially subversive threats to authority and their containment can also be part of the strategies of legitimation of the power and authority of the ruler.

In conclusion, it could be said that power always exists in the context of the relationship between different members of society, and also between members of different societies. This means that power is relational, and cannot exist in a vacuum. The actions of the members of one part of society could also affect or be affected by members of other parts of society that find a voice in Shakespeare's plays. At this stage we can also be reminded of the relationship between power and knowledge, or access to knowledge as it is contained in discourse, and the perception of truth, which ultimately affects and is affected by the formation of power relationships. Shakespeare addresses all of these issues and more in these and other plays, which can sometimes be seen in a new light if they are read from a Bakhtinian or Foucauldian perspective.

Bibliography

Altman, Joel B. "'Vile Participation': The Amplification of Violence in the Theatre of *Henry V.*" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42.1 (Spring 1991): 1-32.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World.* Translated by Hélène Iswolsky. First Midland Book Edition. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Bakhtin, MM. *The Dialogic Imagination.* Edited and introduced by Michael Holquist, translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. 7th paperback ed. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Barber, CL. "Rule and Misrule in *Henry IV.*" In *Shakespeare: Henry IV Parts I and II. A Casebook.* Ed. GK Hunter. London: Macmillan, 1970. 212-230.

Barker, Francis and Hulme, Peter. "'Nymphs and Reapers Heavily Vanish'': The Discursive Contexts of *The Tempest.*" *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism. A Reader.* Ed. Kiernan Ryan. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 117-124.

Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory. An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.

Barton, Anne. *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1977.

Belsey, Catherine. "Towards Cultural History - in Theory and Practice." *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism. A Reader.* Ed. Kiernan Ryan. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 82-91.

Belsey, Catherine. *The Subject of Tragedy. Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama.* London and New York: Methuen, 1985.

Bennet, Tony. *Outside Literature.* London: Routledge, 1990.

Bergeron, David M. "*Richard II* and Carnival Politics." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42.1 (Spring 1991): 33-43.

Berman, Ronald (ed.). *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Henry V. A Collection of Critical Essays*. A Spectrum Book. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

Berry, Philippa. *Of Chastity and Power. Elizabethan Literature and the Unmarried Queen*. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.

Betts, Lenore and Frescura, Gaby. "Theatrical Metaphor in the Henriad". In *Postgraduate Conference 3*. Ed. Vanessa Johnstone and Peter Bailey. Stellenbosch: Department of English, University of Stellenbosch, 1999. 1-8.

Brannigan, John. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*. Transitions. London: Macmillan Press, 1998.

Bristol, Michael D. *Carnival and Theater: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England*. New York and London: Routledge, 1989.

Brooke, Nicholas (ed.). *Shakespeare: Richard II. A Casebook*. London: Macmillan, 1982.

Brotton, Jerry. "'This Tunis, sir, was Carthage': Contesting Colonialism in *The Tempest*". In *Post-Colonial Shakespeares*. Ed. Ania Loomba and Martin Orkin. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. 1-19.

Brown, Paul. "'This Thing of Darkness I Acknowledge Mine': *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism." *Political Shakespeare*. Ed. Jonathan Dollimore and Allan Sinfield. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985. 48-71.

Carey-Webb, Allen. "National and Colonial Education in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 5.1 (May, 1999): 3.1-39. 23 October 2000. <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/05-1/cwebtemp.html>

Cavanagh, Dermot. "The Language of Treason in *Richard II*." *Shakespeare Studies* 27 (1995): 134-160.

Clark, Katerina and Holquist, Michael. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1984.

Cohen, Derek. *The Politics of Shakespeare*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

Cohen, Walter. *Drama of a Nation. Public Theatre in Renaissance England and Spain*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Colebrook, Clare. *New Literary Histories. New Historicism and Contemporary Criticism*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1997.

Cox, John D. *Shakespeare and the Dramaturgy of Power*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Danson, Lawrence. "Henry V: King, Chorus and Critics." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 34.1 (1983): 27-43.

Dawson, Anthony B. *"Measure for Measure*, New Historicism and Theatrical Power." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39 (1988): 328-341.

Dentith, Simon. *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

Derrida, Jacques. "Différance." *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism. A Reader*. Ed. Kiernan Ryan. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 28-31.

Dollimore, Jonathan and Sinfield, Alan (ed.s). *Political Shakespeare. New Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985.

Dollimore, Jonathan and Sinfield, Alan. "History and Ideology: The Instance of *Henry V*." *Alternative Shakespeares*. Ed. John Drakakis. London and New York: Methuen, 1985. 206-227.

Dollimore, Jonathan. "Introduction: Shakespeare, Cultural Materialism and the New Historicism" in *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Ed. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985. 2-17

Dollimore, Jonathan. "Transgression and Surveillance in *Measure for Measure*" in *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Ed. Jonathan

Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985. 72-87.

Dollimore, Jonathan. *Radical Tragedy. Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. Brighton, Sussex: The Harvester Press Limited, 1984.

Donaldson, Peter S. "Taking on Shakespeare: Kenneth Branagh's *Henry V*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42.1 (1991): 60-74.

Drakakis, John D. (ed.). *Alternative Shakespeares*. London and New York: Methuen, 1985.

Dreyfuss, Hubert L. and Rabinow, Paul. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983. 208-226.

During, Simon. *Foucault and Literature: Towards a Genealogy of Writing*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

Du Toit, Seugnet. "The Influence of the Theories of Ferdinand de Saussure and Mikhail Bakhtin on Modern Literary Criticism: The New Emphasis on the Importance of Language in the Study of Literature." In *Postgraduate Conference 3*. Ed. Vanessa Johnstone and Peter Bailey. Stellenbosch: Department of English, University of Stellenbosch, 1999. 38-42.

Du Toit, Seugnet. "Towards a Foucauldian Analysis of *Measure for Measure*." In *Proceedings of the 2001 Postgraduate Conference 24 August 2001*. Ed. Jacques Van Heerden. Stellenbosch: Department of English, University of Stellenbosch, 2001. 92-97.

Earnshaw, Steven. *The Direction of Literary Theory*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1996.

Fitter, Chris. "Review of *Surveillance, Militarism and Drama in the Elizabethan Era*." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 4.1 (May, 1998): 8.1-4.

Fletcher, Angus. "*Complicity* and the Genesis of Shakespearean Discourse." *Shakespeare Studies 27* (1995): 37-41.

Forbes, Jill. *"Henry V."* *Sight and Sound* (1989): 258-259.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Foucault, Michel. "Panopticism." *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism. A Reader*. Ed. Kiernan Ryan. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 11-16.

Foucault, Michel. *Power/ Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*, Vol. 1. New York: Pantheon, 1978.

Foucault, Michel. "The Order of Discourse." In *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Ed. Robert Young. London: Routledge, 1981.

Foucault, Michel. "The Subject and Power." In *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983. 208-226.

Gallagher, Catherine. "Marxism and the New Historicism." *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism. A Reader*. Ed. Kiernan Ryan. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 37-48.

Geertz, Clifford. "The Impact of the Concept of Culture on the Concept of Man." *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism. A Reader*. Ed. Kiernan Ryan. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 5-10.

Gleicher, Jules. "Shakespeare's English History Plays as Political Science Pedagogy." *Teaching Political Science* 15.3 (Spring 1988): 98-103.

Goddard, Harold C. *Chapter XXXVI. "The Tempest"* in *The Meaning of Shakespeare*, Vol. 2. Chicago: Phoenix Books, 1951.

Goldberg, Jonathan. *James 1 and the Politics of Literature. Jonson, Shakespeare and Their Contemporaries*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Goldberg, Jonathan. *"Measure for Measure as Social Text."* *New Historicism and*

Cultural Materialism. A Reader. Ed. Kiernan Ryan. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 117-124.

Graff, Gerald. "Co-optation." *The New Historicism*. Ed. H Aram Veeser. London and New York: Routledge, 1989. 168-181.

Greenblatt, Stephen (ed.). *Representing the English Renaissance*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1992.

Greenblatt, Stephen and Gunn, Giles (ed.). *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1992.

Greenblatt, Stephen. "Invisible Bullets: Renaissance Authority and its Subversion, *Henry IV* and *Henry V*." *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Eds Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985.

Greenblatt, Stephen. "Resonance and Wonder." *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism. A Reader*. Ed. Kiernan Ryan. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 55-60.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonders of the New World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Shakespearean Negotiations*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988.

Hedrick, Donald K. "War is Mud: Branagh's Dirty Harry V and the Types of Political Ambiguity." *Shakespeare, the Movie: Popularizing the plays on film, TV, and video*. Ed. Lynda E. Boose and Richard Burt. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Heinemann, Margot. "How Brecht Read Shakespeare." *Political Shakespeare*. Ed. Jonathan Dollimore and Allan Sinfield. Manchester: Manchester University

Press, 1985. 202-230.

Hirschkop, Ken and Shepherd, David (ed.s). *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1989.

Holderness, Graham, Nick Potter and John Turner. *Shakespeare: The Play of History*. London: Macmillan Press, 1988.

Holderness, Graham. "Part One. Theatres of History: Chronicle Plays". In *Shakespeare: The Play of History* by Graham Holderness, Nick Potter and John Turner. London: Macmillan Press, 1988.

Holquist, Michael. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his World*. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Howard, Jean. "The New Historicism in Renaissance Studies." *English Literary Renaissance* 16 (1986): 13-43.

Hunter, G K. *Shakespeare: King Henry IV Parts 1 & 2. A Casebook*. London: Macmillan, 1982.

Johnson, Lemuel A. *Shakespeare in Africa (And Other Venues). Import and the Appropriation of Culture*. Trenton, NJ and Asmara, Eritrea: African World Press, Inc., 1998.

Kastan, David Scott (ed.). *A Companion to Shakespeare*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

Kavanagh, James H. "Shakespeare in Ideology." *Political Shakespeare*. Ed. Jonathan Dollimore and Allan Sinfield. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985. 144-165.

Kearney, J A. "Prospero: Learning a New Magic". *Crux: A Journal on the Teaching of English* 22.3 (August 1988): 49-56.

Kurzweil, Edith. *The Age of Structuralism: Lévi-Strauss to Foucault*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Lentricchia, Frank and McLaughlin, Thomas (eds). *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1990.

Lentricchia, Frank. "Foucault's Legacy - A New Historicism?" *The New Historicism*. Ed. H Aram Veeser. London and New York: Routledge, 1989. 231-242.

Lentricchia, Frank. *Ariel and the Police: Michel Foucault, William James, Wallace Stevens*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.

Levinson, Marjorie. "The New Historicism: Back to the Future." *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism. A Reader*. Ed. Kiernan Ryan. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 101-112.

Loomba, Ania and Orkin, Martin (eds). *Post-Colonial Shakespeares*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

Loomba, Ania and Orkin, Martin. "Introduction" in *Post-Colonial Shakespeares*. Eds Ania Loomba and Martin Orkin. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. 1-19.

McLuskie, Kathleen. "The Patriarchal Bard: Feminist Criticism and Shakespeare: *King Lear* and *Measure for Measure*." In *Political Shakespeare: New essays in Cultural Materialism*. Eds Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985. 88-108.

McNay, L. *Foucault: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers, 1994.

Merquior, JG. *Foucault*. London: Fontana Press, 1985.

Montrose, Louis A. "'Shaping Fantasies": Figurations of Gender and Power In Elizabethan Culture.' *Representing the English Renaissance*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1992. 31-64.

Montrose, Louis A. "'Eliza, Queen of Shepheardes,' and the Pastoral of Power." *English Literary Renaissance* 10 (1980), 153-82.

Montrose, Louis A. "Of Gentlemen and Shepheardes: The Politics of Elizabethan Pastoral Form." *ELH* 50 (1983), 415-459.

Montrose, Louis A. "Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture." *The New Historicism*. Ed. H Aram Veeser. London and New York: Routledge, 1989. 15-36.

Morris, Pam (ed.). *The Bakhtin Reader. Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov*. London and New York: Edward Arnold. A Member of the Hodder Headline Group, 1994.

Mullaney, Steven. "Strange Things, Gross Terms, Curious Customs: The Rehearsal of Cultures in the Late Renaissance." *Representing the English Renaissance*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1992. 65-93

Orgel, Stephen. "Introduction". *The Tempest* by William Shakespeare. Ed. Stephen Orgel. The Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford and New York, 1987.

Orgel, Stephen. "Prospero's Wife." *Representing the English Renaissance*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1992. 217-230.

Parrinder, Patrick. *Authors and Authority: English and American Criticism 1750 - 1990*. London: Macmillan, 1991.

Patterson, Annabel. *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice*. Cambridge and Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Patterson, Lee. "Historical Criticism and the Claims of Humanism." *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism. A Reader*. Ed. Kiernan Ryan. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 92-101.

Pecora, Vincent C. "The Limits of Local Knowledge." *The New Historicism*. Ed. H Aram Veeser. London and New York: Routledge, 1989. 243-276.

Pinciss, G M. "The Old Honor and the New Courtesy: '1 Henry IV.'" *Shakespeare Survey 31* (1978): 85-91.

Potter, A M. "The Perception of Myth as Myth in Shakespeare's *King Henry V.*" *English Studies in Africa* 33.1 (1990): 15-25.

Prior, Moody E. *The Drama of Power. Studies in Shakespeare's History Plays.* Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Quinn, Michael (ed.). *Shakespeare: Henry V. A Casebook.* London: Macmillan, 1980.

Rabinow, Paul (ed.). *The Foucault Reader. An Introduction to Foucault's Thought.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1991.

Reese, M. M. *The Cease of Majesty. A Study of Shakespeare's History Plays.* London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd, 1961.

Righter, Anne. *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play.* Westport: Greenwood Press, 1962.

Ryan, Kiernan. *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism. A Reader.* London and New York: Arnold, 1996.

Shakespeare, William. "Henry IV Part 1". Ed. P H Davison. In *William Shakespeare: Four Histories.* Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994.

Shakespeare, William. "Henry IV Part 2". Ed. P H Davison. In *William Shakespeare: Four Histories.* Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994.

Shakespeare, William. "Henry V". In *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works.* Eds Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Shakespeare, William. "Richard II". Ed. Stanley Wells. In *William Shakespeare: Four Histories.* Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994.

Shakespeare, William. "Richard III". In *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works.* Eds Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Shakespeare, William. *Measure for Measure*. Ed. N.W. Bawcutt. The Oxford Shakespeare. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works*. Compact Edition. Eds Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. The Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Shakespeare, William. *The Tempest*. Ed. Stephen Orgel. The Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Shanker, Sidney. *Shakespeare and the Uses of Ideology*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1975.

Sinfield, Allan. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Sinfield, Allan. *Literature in Protestant England*. London and Canberra: Croom Helm, Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and noble Books, 1983.

Stead, CK (ed.). *Shakespeare: Measure for Measure: A Casebook*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1971.

Tennenhouse, Leonard. "Strategies of State and Political Plays: *A Midsummer Night's Dream, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VIII*." *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Eds Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985. 109-128

Tennenhouse, Leonard. *Power on Display. The Politics of Shakespeare's Genres*. New York and London: Methuen, 1986.

Thayer, C G. *Shakespearian Politics*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1983.

Tillyard, E M W. *Shakespeare's History Plays*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1962.

Traversi, Derek. "The Historical Pattern from *Richard II* to *Henry V*." *Shakespeare: The Histories. A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Eugene M. Waith. Englewood Cliffs, N J: Prentice- Hall, Inc., 1965.

Turner, John. "Introduction." In *Shakespeare: The Play of History* by Graham Holderness, Nick Potter and John Turner. London: Macmillan Press, 1988.

Veeser, H Aram (ed.). *The New Historicism Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Veeser, H Aram (ed.). *The New Historicism*. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.

Von Rosador, Kurt Tetzeli. "The Power of Magic: From *Endimion* to *The Tempest*." *Shakespeare Survey* 43 (1991): 1-13.

Weimann, Robert. *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theatre. Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function*. Ed. Robert Schwartz. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Weiss, Theodore. *The Breath of Kings and Clowns: Shakespeare's Early Comedies and Histories*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1971.

Wharton, T F. *Henry the Fourth, Parts One and Two: Text and Performance*. London: Macmillan, 1983.

Williams, Raymond. "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory." *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism. A Reader*. Ed. Kiernan Ryan. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 22-27.

Wood, Nigel (ed.). *Henry IV Parts One and Two*. Theory in Practice. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1995.

Wood, Nigel (ed.). *Measure for Measure*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1996.

Worral, David. "Foucault and Shakespeare". *En 251 Approaches to Shakespeare Week 2*. Language and Literature. En 251 Home. St Mary's Home. 26 September 2000. 15 November 2000. <http://www.smuc.ac.uk/scg/en251/en251_2.htm>

Worral, David. *"Measure for Measure"*. *En 251 Approaches to Shakespeare Week 3*. Language and Literature. En 251 Home. St Mary's Home. 26 September 2000. 15 November 2000. <http://www.smuc.ac.uk/scg/en251/en251_3.htm>

Worral, David. "Studying Shakespeare using Michel Foucault and Cultural Materialist Theories." *EN 251 Approaches to Shakespeare Supplementary Topics 3*. Language and Literature. En 251 Home. St. Mary's Home. 26 September 2000. 15 November 2000. <http://www.smuc.ac.uk/scg/en251.htm>

Worral, David. *"The Tempest." En 251 Approaches to Shakespeare Week 10*. Language and Literature. En 251 Home. St. Mary's Home. 26 September 2000. 15 November 2000. <http://www.smuc.ac.uk/scg/en251/en251_10.htm>

Young, Robert. "Post-Structuralism: An Introduction." In *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Ed. Robert Young. London: Routledge, 1981. 1-28.